

Monthly Repository.

No. CLXVIII.]

DECEMBER, 1819.

[Vol. XIV.

Lufston,
Sir, September 17, 1819.

OBSERVING in your last Number [p. 512] an Obituary of the late Rev. Josiah Townsend, of Ealand, it brought to my recollection a letter which I received from him some years ago, containing some account of his father. This narrative I designed to lay before the public, in a work which was then in course of publication; but as I do not intend to pursue that work any further, I have sent it you for insertion, in case it suits the design of the Monthly Repository.

W. W.

"The Rev. MEREDITH TOWNSEND was the eldest son of the Rev. John Townsend, a Baptist minister, who was well-known to many as having been a school-master and an occasional preacher in London, and who died June 3, 1766, aged 81. Concerning him it is particularly worthy of remark, that, after he settled in London, he became member of a Baptist society there; and that, for having communicated occasionally with the Independent society at Stoke-Newington, (then under the care of the Rev. Samuel Snashall,) he was censured, if not expelled, by the church, as walking disorderly.

"His eldest son, the subject of the present memoirs, was born at Pool, in Dorsetshire, August 23, 1715, O. S., and was about seven years old when his father removed to London. It was (he writes) in the 18th year of his age, that some very deep impressions were made on his mind by hearing a sermon from a young man; which impressions continued, though with great variations. He was baptized at eighteen by Mr. Wilson, minister to the society in which Mr. Abraham Booth lately laboured. But, when he had studied the controversy about baptism more particularly, the result of his inquiries was, that he became a Pseudo-baptist; in consequence of which all his own children, excepting one which died the day

after its birth, were baptized in their infancy.

"Mr. M. Townsend's thoughts were, on occasion of a fit of illness, strongly turned to the ministry. Having pursued grammar-learning for some time, he was placed under the care of the Rev. Mr. Eaves, September 4, 1738. When he came out into the ministry, he preached occasionally in and about London, and became assistant in a school of great repute at Peckham, in Surry. On February 5, 1741—2, he was chosen assistant (his own words are) 'to the amiable Watts and the excellent Price;' whom he never afterwards mentioned but in terms of the highest respect. But after having spent four years in that situation, being much discouraged by the little success which seemed to attend his labours, he left London, and went to Hull, June 2, 1746, upon an invitation from the congregation at Dagger-Lane Meeting, to be assistant to their pastor Mr. Wildboar. On July 20 following, he was chosen to this service, and accepted of it; and on May 10, 1749, he was ordained co-pastor with Mr. Wildboar, as appears from the certificate of the ministers concerned in the solemnity. While at Hull he was prevailed upon to print a few poems, the strain of which is very serious and spiritual; but he did not prefix his name to them. He also published a sermon there from Isa. xxvii. 8, on occasion of the defeat of the rebels; which he dedicated to the congregation in Berry Street, London. And it may not be improper to add in this place, that he afterwards published a sermon from Rev. ii. 10, which was preached Sept. 27, 1761, being the Lord's-day after the coronation of their present Majesties. On May 10, 1748, he was married to Mary, youngest daughter of John and Rebecca Basnett, of Peckham, a devout person, and one who loved God with all her heart; with whom he lived happily for almost twenty-eight years.

She died at Stoke-Newington, Feb. 8, 1776, aged 61. They had five children; of whom two only, a son (the late Rev. Josiah Townsend) and a daughter, now survive their excellent parents.

" Mr. Townsend's residence at Hull was not of long continuance. His usefulness and comfort were destroyed by the prevalence of a very unchristian spirit in the society with which he was connected. He, therefore, accepted an invitation given him to succeed the Rev. Samuel Snashall, as pastor of the congregation of Protestant Dissenters at Stoke-Newington, in Middlesex: and, accordingly, after taking a most affectionate leave of his friends at Hull, on Lord's-day, April 5, 1752, he left them the day following. At Stoke-Newington he was the much esteemed shepherd of a numerous and respectable flock; and no one who ever sustained the ministerial character, could more justly have addressed to his hearers (had not his well-known humility and modesty forbidden it) the appeal of Paul to the Thessalonians: 'Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily and justly and unblameably we behaved ourselves among you, as ye know how we exhorted and admonished and charged every one of you, as a father doth his children, that ye would walk worthy of God, who hath called you unto his kingdom and glory.' Most of his early connexions at Newington took leave of this world before him, of whom a list is given, and to whom a very honourable testimony is borne, in an obituary found among his papers. Those of them who remain (it is not doubted) will long regard his memory as precious; and will be ready to attest, that he faithfully declared the gospel according to the views he was led to entertain of it, and especially as a doctrine according to godliness; that in public prayer he was fervent; in preaching, plain, serious and earnest; in the administration of the Lord's Supper, and in his addresses to young people, remarkably affectionate and pathetic: that his temper was unassuming; his conversation, whenever an opportunity could be found or made of introducing any thing serious, instructive: and that, in consequence of the pru-

dence and peaceableness of his behaviour, he had not an enemy living or dying. For the space of thirty-seven years did the congregation at Stoke-Newington enjoy the benefit of his ministerial labours. But in the year 1787, the total failure of his voice, brought on most probably by pulpit exertions, which always exceeded his strength, obliged him to resolve on retiring from public services. The congregation, therefore, over which he presided, invited the Rev. Mr. Hodgkins to be his assistant, and, two years afterwards, to be his successor. After bearing an important part in the ordination of Mr. Hodgkins, and once more administering the Lord's Supper to his beloved flock, he quitted them in July, 1789, to their mutual regret.

" From Stoke-Newington Mr. Townsend removed to Fairford, in Gloucestershire, and took up his abode for seven years in the house of his son, who was then minister to a small congregation there: but on the removal of the latter from Fairford to Ealand, in Yorkshire, he chose to fix his residence in Bath, that he might be near his daughter. And here he received, what he had long been wishing and waiting for, a release from infirmity and pain. He had been frequently exercised, for many years, with very painful attacks of the stone and gravel. The summer before his death he suffered from one, which was peculiarly violent and distressing, and from which his constitution received a shock he never recovered. He continued enfeebled in body, but cheerful in mind, till the night of November 17, 1801, when, having occasion to get out of bed, he fell on the floor, and was unable to rise without help. When his daughter once and again lamented this accident as unfortunate, he gently chid her, saying, 'Why do you call that unfortunate which may be the method that Divine Wisdom has thought fit to make use of to bring about what I have been so long wishing and praying for?' He continued perfectly collected to the last, complained of nothing but increasing weakness, and discovered a full persuasion that his end was drawing near. Frequently would he say, 'I have been quietly and, I hope,

patiently waiting for thy salvation, O Lord; and, I trust, the time of deliverance is not far distant.' He saw no one for many days before his death, excepting his own family, and even them but for a little while at a time. It was thought that he wished to be alone, as finding it a hinderance to his devotions to say much to others; but what he did say was most pertinent, and shewed how much his thoughts were directed upwards. The evening before his death he was remarkably cheerful and even facetious: but on his daughter rejoicing in his good spirits and cheerfulness, he answered, as if he would say, 'Do not build upon this, it is but transient.' And so it proved. His attendant said that she heard him praying at intervals till four o'clock of the next morning. Having been a little relieved from a pain in the chest, (of the return of which he complained,) he ordered her to go into the next room and take a nap, as he was about to do the same. She watched for near half an hour; when, not hearing him cough as usual, she returned to his chamber, and found his eyes closed, his breath departed, and every appearance of his having gone off in his sleep without a struggle. What a singular answer to his prayers, that he might have a gentle, easy dismissal! Often had he been heard to say, 'Oh, that it might please God to permit me quietly to slip away without any noise or bustle!' Thus, then, were his wishes granted. He fell asleep in Jesus on the morning of the Lord's-day, December 13, 1801, in the 87th year of his age. 'Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace.'

A WORK has lately been published at Paris, entitled "Discursos sobre una Constitucion Religiosa considerada como Parte de la Civil Nacional," by M. LIORENTE, the author of the Critical History of the Inquisition, &c., in which a series of articles are proposed to the rising Republics of South America, as the foundation of their religious constitutions. They are so liberal in their spirit, though the work of a Catholic, that we are only doing the author an act of justice by introducing some of them to our readers.

The Roman Catholic religion is declared to be the religion of the state, whose ministers shall be paid from the national funds; but the exercise of every other religion shall be equally protected, and its professors entitled to equal civil rights.

No other symbol of faith shall be recognized but the Apostles' Creed and the seven sacraments. Neither confession nor communion, nor attendance at mass shall be compulsory. Saints' days shall be abolished, and the bishops and vicars shall be enjoined to ascertain that the services of the church be conducted with simplicity and devotion.

Fasting shall not be imposed; it is an act of individual fervour and devotion.

The church shall have no power to dissolve the matrimonial bond. That power exists only in the Supreme Council of the nation. No perpetual religious vows shall be allowed, nor any vows which impose celibacy. The clerical profession shall be no impediment to matrimony.

The clerical orders shall be archbishops, bishops, presbyters, deacons and subdeacons. Their duties are particularly defined in several following articles. If any complaints be made against an ecclesiastic, they must be made to the order which ranks immediately above him; if redress be refused, the Supreme Council of the nation shall take cognizance of the same.

No reference shall be made to the Pope on any subject of pure discipline; the Episcopal authority being wholly competent to the government of the diocese; and no bull shall be promulgated without the consent of the National Council.

The ecclesiastical division of the country shall be the same as the civil; the capital of every province being the centre of the ecclesiastical body.

The Pope shall have no veto over the appointment of the Episcopal body.

On these and other articles the author enlarges to prove their consistency with the early practice of the Christian Church. He will recognize no novelties which have a later date than the third century, and takes for granted that the spirit of Christianity is as friendly to religious as to civil free-

dom. He insists that the early Fathers constantly appealed to the reason and the moral conviction of their converts, and that if other weapons are necessary now, the doctrine they are leagued with to defend, must be inconsistent with the original purity of the Christian faith. He shews the selfishness, the ambition, the fraud, which built on the foundation of the gospel the scaffolding of priestly encroachments and kingly despotism. Confession, indulgencies, tithes, the monastic system, spiritual courts and other antichristian institutions, were made the instruments of their profligacy and plunder and aggrandizing power.

He denies the right of the church to require any other profession of faith than the admission of the great fundamentals of Christianity, that which has been the belief of all Christians in all ages. He asserts that the communion of the Lord's Supper was a simple act of faith in the early history of the church, and ridicules the extravagant notions connected with fast and feast-days.

He argues at length against matrimony being considered either as a sacrament or a religious rite. It was clearly not established by Christianity, nor did the Christian Church pretend to interfere with it for many centuries.

As authority for opposing the intervention of the Pope in matters of discipline and internal arrangements, he quotes with approbation the constitution of the Gallican clergy in 1791. He shews that the authority possessed by Rome in the early ages emanated from it, not as the apostolic see, but as the capital of the empire; and that Alexandria, Antioch, and other places, held their station in ecclesiastic matters, because they were cities of second and third rank, politically considered.

He proposes a great diminution of the clerical orders; their excess being a serious burthen on the state, unnecessary for the maintenance of religion, unfriendly to industry and to liberty. While he enforces the necessity of their being amply provided for, he shews the desirableness of something like an equalization of their revenues.

As to the celibacy of the clergy, he

supposes, on the authority of the Christian Fathers, that John was the only unmarried apostle; that, till the fourth century, the clergy were universally allowed to marry. He shews how this corruption gradually insinuated itself into the church, and what a convenient instrument it has been for detaching men from the common interest of the human race,—and proves, from the examples of the Protestant churches, how friendly a reform on this head has been to their respectability and to their general virtue.

He recommends that the monastic orders be silently annihilated by the non-admission of novices; a simple and admirable arrangement which was adopted by the Spanish Cortes during the short era of their government.

On the whole, these "Discursos" do infinite honour to the spirit of the times: they shew that a more extensive charity is pervading our brethren, and they give hope of that brighter day in which one bond, that of Christian affection, shall embrace the whole world.

J. B.

Paris, Nov. 8, 1819.

London,

SIR, November 20, 1819.
PERCEIVING on the back of your last Repository an advertisement of a Sermon by the Rev. G. Harris, of Liverpool, with a List of the Unitarian Chapels and Congregations in England, Scotland and Wales, I procured it for the indulgence of my curiosity. In the Preface, the Author, speaking of the title *Unitarian*, says, "He has confined it to that part of the Antitrinitarian body who believe in the proper unity of God, and the humanity of Jesus Christ—particularly as he considers the truth to be as much opposed to *Arianism* as to *Trinitarianism*!" After this definition of *Unitarian*, it was with no small surprise I met with the following reputed *Arian* chapels and congregations in his List of *Unitarians*. " Carter-Lane, St. Paul's, Rev. J. Barrett; Hanover-Street, Long-Acre, Mr. Lane; Jewin-Street, Aldersgate-Street, A. Rees, D. D.; Monkwell-Street, Cripplegate, J. Lindsay, D. D.; Worship-Street, Finsbury-Square, J. Evans, A. M.;"

as well as "Broadstairs, Mr. Christopher." Now, I ask for information whether these worthy pastors, with their respective flocks, have undergone any recent change of religious sentiment; or whether the preacher, in making up his *Unitarian List*, forgot his definition, and so unwittingly proclaimed to the world the truth that *Arians* are Unitarians; thus proving himself to be under the operation of gospel charity. Mr. Richard Wright, I observe, has assisted in drawing out the List, but he is a liberal gentleman, and has no concern with the contracted definition of *Unitarian* given on the occasion. Each of the above ministers, or some of their congregations, may probably call for an explanation. I am far from imputing to Mr. Harris intentional misrepresentation. He says, "Inaccuracies pointed out he will correct." Indeed, it is possible that, belonging to that class of modern Unitarians who have predicted the speedy extinction of *Arianism*, he has, in the superabundance of his youthful zeal to swell out the List of Unitarians in England, Scotland and Wales, fondly mistaken the prophecy for its accomplishment! Expecting a ready insertion of these remarks in your valuable *Miscellany*, which I have taken from its commencement, I beg leave to declare myself a lover of truth and consistency, as well as

AN UNITARIAN OF THE OLD SCHOOL.

P. S. It is a curious circumstance that Mr. Christopher, of Broadstairs, here proclaimed as an *Unitarian*, entertained so great an antipathy to *Unitarianism*, as to have declared from the pulpit, not long ago, its alliance to *Deism*! An intelligent gentleman of the Gravel-Pit Congregation, Hackney, happening to be present, called on Mr. Christopher at the conclusion of the service, and before the congregation, for an explanation. Mr. Christopher, to his honour, acknowledged his inaccuracy, and will, no doubt, be more liberal on future occasions.

Clapton,

August 5, 1819.

SIR,
YOUR Correspondent (p. 406)
will, I trust, excuse me if I assure him that there is no *Act of Parliament* to declare "Dissenters"

sprinkling or dipping" to be "baptism," but that the whole question remains within the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts. Under such sanction, he will, I believe, find that "the clergy have done in this affair" only what they ought to have done, and that "for their conduct" they have the most satisfactory *precedent*. I here take for granted that Mr. Read is correct in stating that the "young lady" who applied for *confirmation*, "had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Had there, on the contrary, been evidence that the words used, "twenty-one years ago," were, *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*, his charge against the clergy would have been fully established; and "the bishop of the diocese," with such evidence before him, by deciding "that it was safer to go through the baptismal form," would have opposed himself to the opinions of bishops, of no light authority, in other times.

The Established *Church*, or, as it has been more correctly expressed, the Established *Sect*, regard, as it is well known, all *baptism* which is not administered by an Episcopal clergyman, as *lay-baptism*. On the validity of such *baptism*, there has been, within the *Establishment* itself, no small controversy. The earliest of which I am aware, was in 1573, between Dr. Whitgift, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, and the celebrated Puritan *Cartwright*. The latter, in conformity, as it appears, with the judgment of the foreign Protestants, thus argued, in his *Defence of the Admonition to the Parliament*:

"As for the baptizing by laymen, considering that it is not only against the word of God, but also founded upon a false ground, and upon an imagined necessity, which is none indeed, it moveth me nothing at all, although it be very ancient; for so much as the sacrament dependeth chiefly of the institution and word of God; which is the form and, as it were, the life of the sacrament, of which institution this is one, and, of the chief parts, that it should be celebrated by a minister."

Dr. Whitgift, in his "Defence of the Answer to the Admonition," thus replied:

"Whereas you say, that the mi-

nister is one of the chief parts, and, as it were, the life of the sacrament: in so weighty a cause and great a matter, it had been well if you had used some authority of Scripture, or testimony of a learned author. For so far as I can read, the testimony of learned men is, that the essential form, and, as it were, the life of baptism, is to baptize *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; which form being observed, the sacrament remaineth in full force and strength, of whomsoever it be ministered, or howsoever by ceremonies or other additions it is corrupted."

I quote these passages from "A Defence of the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of England against some Modern Innovations, 1712." This Defence was *anonymous*, but is attributed, in MS. on the title-page, to "Dr Turner, Vicar of Christ-Church, London, and of Greenwich." Of these *innovations* one was, "baptism, administered by *laymen*, invalid." On this subject Mr. Nichols thus writes:

"In 1711 there arose a controversy concerning the validity or invalidity of *lay-baptism*, in which some of our bishops and learned divines were divided in opinion. The occasion of this dispute was as follows: Mr. Laurence, a learned layman, baptized and bred among the Dissenters, was not satisfied concerning the validity of his own baptism, and was baptized by a clergyman of the Church of England; and wrote the following ingenious tracts in defence of what he had done: one entitled, *Lay-Baptism Invalid*, 1711; a Defence of it in the same year; and in 1712, a tract intituled, *Dissenters' Baptism null and void*."

Lit. Anect. IV. 227.

Besides Dr. Turner's Defence, he appeared again in 1713, under the title of "A Country Clergyman." The validity of *lay-baptism* was also maintained in "The Judgment of the Church of England," and "The Second Part of the Judgment, 1712." These were attributed to Bishop Fleetwood, who declares it the judgment of the Church of England, that *lay-baptism*, seriously conferred in *matter and form* prescribed by Christ, is not to be reiterated, although it was irregular, for want of a proper

administrator." To the same purpose the *Upper House of Convocation*, under Queen Anne, thus addressed the *Lower House*: "We, the president and bishops, have thought it incumbent on us to declare, that such persons as have been already baptized in or with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, though their baptism was irregular for want of a proper administrator, ought not to be baptized again." The *High Church Doctors*, Hickes and Brett, contended on the other side; connecting this subject with their doctrines of the *divine right* of the priesthood, and "the necessity and authority of sacerdotal absolution."

In 1714, the same question was discussed between several clergymen and some Dissenters at Exeter, on the following occasion, as described in "A Caveat against the new Sect of Anabaptists, lately sprung up at Exon," attributed to Mr. Withers:

"One Mr. Benjamin Reed, of the city of Exeter, was designed for a Dissenting minister; his parents gave him a suitable education, and he was for several years at a private academy; all this time he seemed to be a resolute Nonconformist; but about two or three months since, he left the Dissenters, and on a sudden declared himself a zealous Churchman. A little after he conformed, he was persuaded to renounce his former baptism as absolutely null and invalid, because it was administered by one who was not episcopally ordained; he submitted to be rebaptized, and the sacrament was solemnly repeated in the parish church of Heavytree, within a mile of Exeter. The person that officiated was one Mr. Jenkinson, who might have passed his life in obscurity if he had not made himself famous for having somewhat to do in so remarkable an affair. The godfathers were two clergymen, Mr. King and Mr. J. Walker." (Pp. 3, 4.)

This pamphlet was followed by "A Defence of the Caveat against the new Sect of Anabaptists, &c., in Answer to Mr. Reed's Reply. By Hubert Stogdon," of whom there is, I believe, some account in one of your early Volumes. [IV. 57, 121 and 247.] In both pamphlets, the charge against the clergy turned upon this

fact, that "they knew Mr. Reed had been baptized with water in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost." (*Defence*, p. 50.) Of the late discussion of this subject, occasioned by a clergyman's refusal to bury any whom he regarded as unbaptized, and the *judgment* of Sir J. Nicholl, you have given a full account (V. 198, 199). I will only add, that the *Deputies*, acting on that *judgment*, have never ventured to interfere, unless it could be proved that the form in *Matthew* was used on the occasion. I have, I am aware, gone further than was necessary to acquit the *clergy* in the opinion of your Correspondent, but I thought much of the above might be new to some of your readers, especially as I find that Dr. Towers, who wrote *Cartwright's Life* in the *Biog. Brit.*, (III. 280,) has not mentioned the subject there, nor in his account of *Cartwright* annexed to *Whitgift's Life* (*Brit. Biog.*, III. 362—364). In 1767 and 1784, when Dr. T. wrote, the question about *lay-baptism* was, I believe, entirely at rest.

The Nonconformist (p. 428) will, I am sure, excuse me if I attempt a correction of the note to his very informing paper, and hazard a remark upon it. "Lord Shaftsbury," the reputed "unbeliever," and the contemporary of *Bolingbroke*, was never "Lord High Chancellor." That office was filled, in 1672, (a short period of lenity towards Dissenters,) by his grandfather, who was, I apprehend, a *state-christian*, and as exemplary in that character, according to a well-known story, as that *most religious king*, his royal master. The author of the *Characteristics* does not appear to have filled any office which required the qualification of the *communion*, unless it were "the Vice-Admiralty of the County of Dorset," from which, according to *Biog. Brit.* (IV. 268), he was removed "on the accession of Queen Anne."

It has been doubted whether "Anthony Collins wrote against *Christianity*," or, rather, against what *Osborne* denominated *Parliament Faith*. Archdeacon Blackburne, who is well known to have written the *Memoirs of Thomas Hollis*, there considers Collins's "ill-will to revelation a matter far from being out of doubt;"

while he commends "his avowed enmity to ecclesiastical usurpation." (*Biog. Brit.* IV. 27.) The "ludicrous and profane manner" which the *Nonconformist*, on the authority, I suppose, of common fame, attributes to Collins, ill accords with the complexion of his life and the circumstances of his last hours, as they are described in the *Biog. Brit.*, not only by Dr. Kippis, but in the previous life by Mr. Broughton, a clergyman who had certainly no predilection for the author of the *Essays* "On Freethinking," and "On the Thirty-nine Articles." Had this story been regarded as authentic, it would, probably, have been mentioned (IV. 26) with Whiston's severe censure of his "old friend" for having received "the holy communion." Collins's "compliment to custom," if he used the expression, was, I think, as justifiable as the conduct of the late Duke of Grafton, who is declared (VI. 469, 951 and 721) to have frequently received the *communion*, the form of which must have been abhorrent to the opinions and feelings of a serious Unitarian.

However Collins attained to magistracy, he appears to have exercised it with a persevering regard to the public interest, and if examples were sufficient for such a purpose, professed Christians have abundantly justified reputed unbelievers in doing what an unprejudiced observer is liable to consider as evil, that good may come. Of this, I think, that eminent Nonconformist, Sir T. Abney, afforded a striking instance.

In the *Memoirs* annexed to his *Funeral Sermon*, in 1722, we are told (p. 77) that "occasional communion with the Established Church he accounted lawful, and all along practised it, when expressing his charity, or holding a capacity for any considerable service made it necessary." He had adopted the accomodating scheme of his early *pastor* Mr. Howe, which *Defoe*, whom Mr. Howe unjustly charged with having "written his piece against Occasional Conformity, in order to reflect upon Sir Thomas Abney," very ably exposed, as may be seen in *Biog. Brit.* (V. 27, 28). Yet when the Bill against Occasional Conformity passed in 1712, and Sir Thomas, urged (*Mem.* p. 57) by "the Resident of Brunswick, who vigo-

rously represented to him how far the interest of his master might depend upon his continuance in his post, was prevailed on to continue," he declined all public worship, probably because he objected to join in the devotional services of the Church, though he had frequently qualified for an office, and thus had declared, if actions have any meaning, that he was a *bonâ fide* Churchman. This indecorous desertion of the public worship of the Church, to which every magistrate was considered, by law, as belonging, and confining himself to worship in his family "for seven years," his biographer, the Rev. Jeremiah Smith, his *Nonconformist* minister, (p. 58,) softly calls a "restraint," which "he endured, (though not without a pious grief,) that he might be capable of serving his country, and securing the interest of King George." Dr. Watts, in his *Dedication to Sir Thomas Abney* of two sermons, preached to his family at Theobalds, during that period, uses the same language, and denounces (Works, 1800, I. 155) "that unrighteous law," the Act against Occasional Conformity, of which, however, those who had qualified under the Test Act, and thus affected to be *Churchmen*, had no right to complain. Indeed, such Nonconformists as Sir Thomas Abney and his friend, another Alderman, Sir John Fryer, appear to have been as *wise in their generation* as any *children of this world*; for while they received peculiar homage from their own party, as the heads of the Nonconformists, they secured, by their *occasional Conformity*, their full share of the honours which the law bestowed on Churchmen.

"A Dissenter" (p. 480, *Note*) "may sit in the House of Commons;" but, I suspect, that all the members of the House are considered as members of that Church, of which they have sworn that the King is *supreme head*, and are all liable, though never likely to be called upon, to receive the *communion*. For the House, I apprehend, has power to repeat such *orders*, as have been frequently enforced in other times.

In 1614, the Commons made "an order, that every member of their body should take the sacrament, at St. Margaret's." (*Parl. Hist.* V. 278.) In 1627 there was a similar order,

enjoining the immediate *receiving*, on all who then "sate in the House," and directing "those which have not sate in the House, not to come into the House till they have received the communion." During the Short Parliament, April, 1640, there was the same *order*, and two such orders at the commencement of the Long Parliament. In 1661, this *order* was repeated: It is *resolved* that, on a *Sunday* appointed, "the sacrament of the Lord's Supper shall be administered at St. Margaret's, according to the form prescribed in the *Liturgy*, and that all the members shall then and there receive the said sacrament, and that whosoever shall not then and there receive the said sacrament, shall not, after that day, come into the House, until he shall have received the said sacrament." A committee is then appointed, who are to receive from the members a *note*, describing their names and the places they represent, "and the said persons, so appointed, are likewise to take particular notice of every member of this House, at such time as he receive the said sacrament;" perhaps to detect any who might not actually *receive*, or not in both kinds. In 1666, this *order* was repeated, probably for the last time.

I quote all the above except the *Order* in 1614, from a 12mo. volume, printed 1756, containing "Orders, &c. collected out of the Journals." To these may be added the following passage between James I. and *Usher*, communicated by the latter to *Sully*, and quoted from *Parr's Life of Usher*, (p. 17,) in *Harris's Lives*, 1814 (I. 91). From the *classical* conclusion it appears that *James* wanted more money than the *Commons* chose to entrust with him.

"I was appointed, by the Lower House of Parliament, to preach at St. Margaret's, Westminster, Feb. 7, 1620. Feb. 13, being Shrove-Tuesday, I dined at court, and betwixt four and five kissed the king's hand, and had conference with him touching my sermon. He said, I had charge of an unruly flock to look unto the next Sunday. He asked me how I thought it could stand with true divinity, that so many hundred should be tied (upon so short warning) to receive the *communion* upon a day, all could not be

in charity, after so late contentions in the House: many must needs come without preparation, and eat their own condemnation. He bad me to tell them, I hoped they were all prepared, but wished they might be better; to exhort them to unity and concord; to love God first, and then their prince and country; to look to the urgent necessities of the times, and the miserable state of Christendom, with *bis dat qui citè dat.*"

Your Reviewer (p. 489) has, I doubt not, fairly quoted "Sir M. Wellwood," and if the Baronet had dealt as fairly with Dr. Priestley, he could not have justly charged him with deducing, from the doctrine of *Necessity*, "conclusions of the most pernicious tendency." The passage professed to be quoted, is the former part of the seventh paragraph of Sect. xi., which is in Vol. III. of the Works, p. 518. Dr. Priestley is there considering a difficulty occurring to "persons firmly persuaded of the truth of the doctrine of Necessity," who yet deem it "not possible to act upon it," and "ask how it is possible for a Necessarian to pray for the pardon of sins." Having adopted Dr. Hartley's well-known distinction "between the *popular* and *philosophical language*, as corresponding to two very different views of human actions," he proceeds to shew that, if a Christian Necessarian's "faith be what Dr. Hartley calls a *practical* one, either in the doctrine of Necessity, or the principles of Christianity, that is, if he really *feels* the principles, and if his affections and conduct be really directed by them, so that they have their natural influence on his mind, it will be impossible for him to be a bad man;" or that "a truly practical Necessarian will stand in no need of the sentiments either of self-applause or self-reproach. He will be under the influence of a much superior principle, *loving God and his fellow-creatures*—from motives altogether independent of any considerations relating to himself." Thus the author introduces the following passage, which the biographer of Dr. Erskine affects to quote. How he quotes, the words *prudently omitted by him*, and here placed between brackets, will sufficiently discover: " [It is acknowledged that] a Necessarian, who [as such] believes that

[strictly speaking] *nothing goes wrong*, but that every thing is under the best direction possible, [himself and his conduct, as part of an immense and perfect whole, included,] cannot accuse himself of having done wrong, in the ultimate sense of the words. He has, therefore, in this strict sense, nothing to do with repentance, confession, or pardon." It is not surprising, after this specimen of the biographer's *Christian sincerity*, that he entirely omitted, in his quotation, the following conclusion of the paragraph, which would have proved his charge against Dr. Priestley to have been nothing better than a calumny:

"But then, if he be really capable of steadily viewing the great system, and his own conduct as a part of it, in this true light, his supreme regard to God, as the great, wise and benevolent author of all things, his intimate communion with him, and devotedness to him, will necessarily be such, that he can have no will but God's. In the sublime, but accurate language of the Apostle John, he will *dwell in love*, he will *dwell in God*, and *God in him*: so that, *not committing any sin*, he will have nothing to repent of. He will be *perfect, as his heavenly Father is perfect.*"

Mr. Belsham is still, where I hope he will long continue, *in arenâ*, and can speak for himself, should he deem such an animadverter deserving of his notice.

J. T. RUTT.

P. S. Since I sent you the letter on Defensive War, (p. 409,) I have remarked, in a note by Mr. Granger, (B. H. II. 245,) a specimen of *Christian animosity*, seldom, if ever, paralleled. Speaking of *Montrose's exploits* against the anti-royalists in Scotland, he says, "It is worthy of remark, that in the memorable battle which he gained in September, 1644, the *word of the rebels was, Jesus and no quarter.*" I question whether *Old Mortality* has any thing to exceed this among his *Covenanters*.

Brief Notes on the Bible.

No. IX.

Matt. xix. 26, "With God all things are possible."

THIS text is so generally quoted in a sense beyond its import, that

a special consideration of it may not be unacceptable. It is very promptly applied to rebut the objections of common sense to the doctrine of the Trinity; and a pretty summary answer, in the absence of a better, and a very convenient one it is.

I feel myself on tender ground, but have an humble trust that it will not fail me.

No doctrine can lack a foundation upon scriptural expressions, wrested in their primary and absolute sense, as the Catholics, to come no nearer, have well exemplified. Jesus said,* "If ye have faith, as a grain of mustard seed, *nothing shall be impossible to you.*" This will be acknowledged, I presume, as equivalent to the language of the text. But who will be found to stickle for the literal construction of such a passage?

I can believe implicitly many things, upon both divine and human authority, which my reason cannot reach, but none which contradict it.

With God, though I admit that all things are possible, yet it is in the restrictive sense of *all possible things.*

Many are not possible to Him.

He himself, in the plenitude of his omnipotence, cannot contravene what his own laws and constitutions have once ordained immutable.

Nor can He, in any instance, betray versatility.

It has been assumed that God could not pardon the sins of mankind, except his justice were satisfied by an *atonement*; such as confounds the human intellect, and makes depreciated reason stand aghast!—which, indeed, might come in a parenthesis, as an orthodox impossibility with God.

Out of which, however, in the form of a negation upon it, arises the moral impossibility that God could, upon that assumption, exact from his creatures a virtue transcending what his own nature is capable of, namely, the forgiveness of all offences and injuries *without atonement.*

God cannot be unjust. He cannot visit limited sin with unlimited punishment.

Having declared,† "I am the Lord: that is my name; and my glory will

I not give to another," he cannot give his glory to another.

And that* "Before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me;" and † "I, even I, am he, and there is no God with me;" he cannot have an associate in his divinity.

And having promulgated † "There shall be one Lord, and his name *one;*" he cannot make it *three.*

(These are but selections from a host of corresponding passages.)

He is not efficient to make two and two five, or two and three but four. He is incapable of the attempt.

So, by parity of statement, not even by any presumable operation of the Divine will or power, which are synonymous, could three persons, each of them God, be one God, and *only* one.

The proposition, involving a numerical contradiction, states an impossibility, in the face of that irreversible system of order and consistency which has the Supreme Being for its author.‡

So impossible is it even for their Creator to realize the conceits and gratuitisms of his creatures.

If any one should oppose, to my view of this momentous subject, God's power to work miracles, or disturb his own establishments, I would simply ask him whether he would have the Trinity considered as a standing miracle, and whether his orthodox brethren would thank him for such a concession?

I presume that none, but a fanatic, will tax the language I have used, for the sake of perspicuity, with irreverence.

That any mathematician should avow himself a Trinitarian, is, of all strange things, perhaps, the strangest. Yet how many have believed in witchcraft! How many in the existence of an evil spirit, possessing the divine attribute of ubiquity, and busy in the seduction of every human being from the allegiance due to his Creator! What, in such cases, wherein we see minds of the sublimest capacity pros-

* Isaiah xliii. 10. † Deut. xxxii. 39.

‡ Zach. xiv. 9.

§ See my "Unity of God," M. Reps. Vol. IV. p. 595.

trate at the shrine of an *early-imbibed superstition*, what can be said, but, with a sigh, alas, poor human nature!

Waving, as not relevant to my purpose, a main branch of the argument, that the doctrine of the Trinity is a human device, gradually and probably superinduced upon the Scriptures; I desire only to enter my protest against such a sweeping perversion of the text as I have aimed to correct, and to remark how sorely they must feel themselves pressed, who seek to shelter themselves under it.

BREVIS.

Chichester,
Nov. 18, 1819.

SIR,
BEING a Christian from conviction that the evidences in support of that faith are full and satisfactory, and adopting the Unitarian creed from a like conviction that it approaches nearer to the truth as it was in Jesus than any other explication of Christianity, I cannot be supposed to have any admiration for the writings of Paine, or for the publications of Carlile. But I cannot conceal my regret, that it should be now thought necessary to visit with punishment any individual for making known his sentiments respecting the Christian faith. It is, I think, paying our well-paid clergy but a bad compliment, to suppose that their talents could not completely answer his objections: it is paying Christianity itself a bad compliment to hint that it requires the support of the law to its defence: and it is demonstrating a sad ignorance of the nature of real religious liberty, and a sad inconsistency in the dispensing of this blessing, if, while we send missionaries to other lands, to shew Pagans the folly of idolatry, we will not suffer an individual in our land to shew us the folly of our creed, provided it appears to him that the wisdom of God belongs not to it.

The ignorance of Scripture which Paine evinced, was pointed out in a masterly manner by Mr. Gilbert Wakefield; and like ignorance was betrayed by Mr. Carlile, in his endeavour to identify Unitarians with Deists; for no ignorance can be greater than that which would rank unbelievers in the Trinity as unbelievers in Christianity. Still, however, Unitarians are

offenders at Common Law, according to the jargon of barristers, as much as Mr. Carlile; and, therefore, he was quite correct in endeavouring to shew that if they are suffered to broach their opinions, he ought to be suffered to broach his. This being the case, I own I am indignant, and most deeply do I regret when I hear Unitarians approving Mr. Carlile's prosecution and conviction. Are they not, in this case, using against him an argument and weapon which the orthodox could use equally against them? But, what is still worse, do they not, by this conduct, plead guilty, in fact, to a charge sometimes made against them, that, had they the power, they would be as intolerant as other sects?

Throughout the writings of Unitarians, it is often expressed, and more frequently insinuated, that their system is liberality itself. While your Catholics and your Protestants have alternately burned each other, each of them being debased with an anti-christian spirit, we are told that Unitarianism forbids all such proceedings. True, remarks the orthodox believer, but this is easily accounted for; you have never yet had the power to persecute. How much, alas! is this observation strengthened, when Unitarians, though not themselves having power to persecute, join the hue and cry with those who have.

It is consistent enough for the descendants of the "man of sin," be they found in Papal Rome, or in Protestant countries, to "rejoice and be exceeding glad," when, under the pretence of holy zeal, they are able to reek their infuriated passions on a defenceless mortal. But for those who plume themselves to be peculiarly the followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, thus to act, shews that their blood is still infected with the impurity which flowed in the veins of the Mother of Abominations.

Let Unitarians express their regret that any should be found blind to the beauties of their Christian faith. Let them, by argument, fortify their children and the ignorant around them, against any moral poison: let them endeavour to convince, and heal the erroneous and sickly judgment of the Deist: but let them not be absurd enough to suppose this conviction, or this happy result, can arise from ma-

nacles or a prison: let them not, for the sake of courting the popularity of imperfect Christians, act upon a rule which is contrary to the directions of him who forbade the fire from heaven to fall on the Samaritans; who declared that man was frequently ignorant of the real spirit he possessed, when he shewed a willingness to be the avenger of the Almighty's honour; and which rule, if rigidly acted on towards themselves, might, simply because they form the weaker sect, consign them to a dungeon.

Perhaps, Mr. Editor, your next Repository will teem with such sentiments from your liberal Correspondents: if so, let my effusion be destroyed; but if not, I beg to record my settled conviction on this affair, in the hope that, though an humble individual, I may be, in some degree, useful in preserving among our body that consistent liberality which forms their greatest glory.

J. F.

Mansfield,

SIR, September 28, 1819.

IN your Reviewer's very excellent and judicious critique upon Dr. Hodgson's Sermon on Stephen's Prayer, [pp. 505—508,] I observe he has adopted the hypothesis stated by the late Rev. Timothy Kenrick, and, if I mistake not, by other Unitarian writers before him, to explain the scene described, *Acts vii. 55, 56*, which, though ingenious, does not appear to me satisfactory. Should the following observations serve to throw any light upon the subject, or lead to any better explanation, the writer will think himself gratified by their insertion in your valuable work.

The explanation of the historian's language may, perhaps, be found by referring to the accusation which was brought against Stephen, and to some passages in the histories of the Evangelists. At the close of *Acts vi.* it is said, that they, "who were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which Stephen spake, suborned men, which said, 'We have heard him speak blasphemous words against this holy place and the law, for we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs, which Moses delivered to us.' " From the

tenor of this testimony it is evident, however his language had been misinterpreted or misapplied, that Stephen had been speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem, and the consequent dispersion of the Jews, involving the discontinuance of many of their sacred customs, undoubtedly predicted by the prophet Daniel, and more pointedly by Jesus himself. When standing before the high-priest and the council, Stephen entered into a brief history of the Jews, and concluded by asserting, that they had rejected and murdered the Just One, of whom Moses and the prophets had spoken, and very plainly intimated, that they would bring upon themselves the judgments which had also been predicted as the consequence of their impenitence and unbelief. This was in fact acknowledging the most aggravating part of the crime, which was laid to Stephen's charge, and we accordingly find, "that when they heard these things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed on him with their teeth." Let us now refer to the language in which this event, the destruction of Jerusalem, is spoken of by Jesus Christ, *Matt. xvi. 27, 28*: "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then shall he reward every man according to his work." The coming to which Jesus refers is particularly evident, for he adds, "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." But his language is more striking, *chap. xxiv. 29, 30*, which is the conclusion of what Jesus had been saying of the destruction of Jerusalem: "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of heaven shall be shaken, and then shall appear the Son of Man in heaven, and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory." This, we may presume, was the only vision which Stephen saw. The conduct of the high-priest and of the Jewish council, not less than that of the elders and the Scribes, who were stirred up against him by his accusers and the false witnesses, convinced Stephen

that the prediction of Jesus would be fulfilled, and that the pride and obstinacy of the Jews were hastening that event; and lifting up his eyes to heaven, in the ardour of anticipation he exclaimed: "*Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God.*" It is probable Stephen's meaning was well understood, and, therefore, the Jews "cried with a loud voice, and stopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord, and cast him out of the city and stoned him."

As to the apostrophe of Stephen, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," for there seems no reason to consider it as a prayer, it must be recollected, that the mind of this first martyr was strongly impressed with the figurative representation which Jesus had given of his appearance as the Son of Man, in the fulfilment of his prediction, and with the connexion of the event with the circumstances of those who would be witnesses of it. His own immediate danger would naturally bring to the mind of Stephen many of those declarations and admonitions of Jesus, which he addressed to those who might endeavour to escape from the impending calamity by unjustifiable means, by a mean denial of their relation to him, or by the concealment of their profession, as his followers; such as the following: "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father, who is in heaven; but whosoever shall deny me before men, him also will I deny before my Father, who is in heaven." "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it, and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it; for what is a man advantaged if he gain the whole world and lose himself, or be cast away; for whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my word, of him shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory and in his Father's, and of his holy angels." It is scarcely possible that these passages should not have been in the mind of Stephen, connected as they are with the very language of Jesus, to which he referred: and therefore it was particularly natural that he should exclaim, at the moment when he was sacrificing his life in the cause, and as a

proof of his attachment to his master, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," accept the offering of my life, which I am now making, rather than deny thee, or the import and meaning of thy words. But surely this can be no warrant for our addresses to Christ, seeing we are not in similar circumstances, and have no reason to suppose that he is present with us, and can either hear or answer our requests. But on this subject we have the express authority of Jesus, in his instructions to his disciples: "In that day," that is, when he was taken from them, "ye shall ask me nothing; verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the FATHER in my name, he shall give it you." It is evident that the historian did not consider this ejaculation or apostrophe of Stephen's as a prayer, for he afterwards observes, that he *kneeled down and prayed*, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." Nor is it conceivable that one "who was full of the holy spirit and of faith," could have acted in direct opposition to the instructions of Jesus, or could have been unmindful of the example and instruction of his Master: "Thou shalt worship Jehovah thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."

J. W.

SIR,

WHILE reading the excellent criticism on Stephen's Prayer, by Hodgson, in your Number for August last, [pp. 505—508,] it brought to my recollection a note in Temple's Letters to Randolph, published in the year 1778, 8vo., and, with your permission, I have copied it for insertion in your valuable Miscellany, as it is out of print, and many of your readers may be unacquainted with it. It is as follows. See p. 213, note.

PHILAETHES.

In the whole New Testament there is no command to pray to Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ himself and his apostles uniformly direct all prayer to be addressed to God only. There is, I am persuaded, no passage in the whole book, that records an instance of proper prayer addressed otherwise than to the person of the Father, except Acts vii. 59, where Stephen, at his

martyrdom, is represented as using these words, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." This, it must be owned, is a direct invocation of the *Lord Jesus* by prayer; and is, in my opinion, one of the greatest difficulties in the Sacred Writings. That Stephen at so solemn a moment, and filled, as he was, with the holy spirit, should have prayed to an improper object, is to me inconceivable. To say that Jesus Christ was present in vision to Stephen, though, if the fact could be proved, it might be allowed great weight, seems to be cutting, not untying the knot. For, considering the time that must necessarily elapse, it is as difficult to conceive that the vision continued till the moment of his martyrdom, as to suppose that he would end his life in the violation of his Master's often repeated command.

The following conjecture, if it should be found sufficiently probable, would remove the whole difficulty, and with all submission to better judgments, I propose it to the consideration of candid and learned Christians.

The reading of our printed copies is *Kυριε Ιησος*, *Lord Jesus*; but eight MSS., one of great antiquity (see Wetstein in loc.), read *Kυριε Ιησος Χριστε*, *Lord Jesus Christ*. It is certain St. Luke did not originally write both; nor could those, whose books had *Kυριε Ιησος*, have added the word *Χριστε* by way of explanation. *Kυριε Ιησος* effectually ascertains the person. Whence then arose the various reading? Nothing will more naturally account for it than to suppose *Kυριε* (*Lord*) simply, to have been the genuine reading; which being understood by different owners of MSS. to mean the *Lord Jesus*, some by way of interpretation would write on the margin the word *Ιησος*, others *Ιησος Χριστε*. Subsequent transcribers would take some the one, some the other expression, as they met with it in the respective MSS. from which they copied, into the body of the text, and thus the original reading would be gradually lost. Take away this single word, and all appearance of inconsistency is removed from a text which otherwise seems not easily reconcileable with the rest of Scripture; the prayer will no longer be addressed to

Jesus Christ, but to the *God and Father of Jesus Christ*, according to the prescription of Jesus Christ himself, "When ye pray, say, our Father—"

This conjecture may expose me to the chastisement of Dr. R. I propose it only to the consideration of cool and dispassionate men, who will understand it, as the real truth is, to be proposed with all diffidence, and from the best of motives, a desire to turn the attention of abler critics to this, I think, very difficult text. Conjectural readings, adopted merely by way of accommodating an hypothesis, are never allowable. A worse reason cannot be imagined. Such readings, however, may sometimes be probable in the highest degree; and if no other instance of prayer, properly so called, indisputably addressed to Jesus Christ, can be pointed out in Scripture; if all prayer is commanded to be addressed to God only, the evidence here stated for the conjecture in question, may possibly be great enough, if not to justify the proposer, yet at least to exempt him from the severity of censure.

SIR,

Clapham.

SOME remarks of mine, which you were so obliging as to insert in the Repository, [p. 356.] respecting the doctrine of atonement, have occasioned two letters in reply, on which account I hope you will allow me to trespass on your patience a little further. My friendly antagonist Mr. Jevans, [p. 550.] if so I may call one from whom I do not know that I at all differ, appears not to have exactly understood my meaning. I will lay the blame of this at my own door, and suppose that I did not express myself clearly. Certainly, there are no things more difficult formally to explain than some of our commonest and simplest ideas, especially when they have become encrusted and disguised by the clumsy workmanship of science, falsely so called. But I was, I must confess, rather surprised that Mr. J. (p. 550) should endeavour to express what he conceived me to mean in language very foreign to the style of my letter. The error which he attributes to me, and which he combats, is, "that the death of Christ is not to be considered as making any

change in the mind of God." Now, I think that to explain the atonement, by referring to changes in the mind of the Deity, is to interpret Latin in Greek, or Greek in Hebrew. I did not, therefore, refer at all to this point, nor use any words of like import, as may be seen, if any of your readers think it worth while to turn to page 356. But as the subject is on the table, I would reply to Mr. Jevans, that, in the same sense as the sacrifices, and other things mentioned by Mr. J., changed the mind of God, I believe that this effect was produced by the death of our Lord. That change was manifested by the repeal of that sentence of death which passed upon Adam, and which, after overshadowing the world above four thousand years, was for ever done away by our Lord's resurrection. However, as this language is not scriptural, and appears to me rather to obscure than illustrate the subject, I would rather avoid the use of it. On the other hand, I beg to say that Mr. J. perfectly meets my views, when he says "that we cannot adopt a surer method to come at the truth concerning the effects of the blood and death of Christ, than by considering what is said concerning the nature and effects of the Jewish sin-offerings." They were not appointed as confirmations of the truth, or as examples of conduct, but they were manifestly the considerations or conditions on which it pleased God, on those several occasions, to suspend his displeasure. Just so the Scripture appears to me to represent the death of our Master: it was the consideration on which it pleased God to suspend the curse of Adam, and establish the new covenant of life and immortality. The point at which I aimed was this, that there appears no ground why either the atonement of the death of Christ, or those made by the Jewish sacrifices, should be referred to those mystical views about the satisfaction of the Divine justice, which the Calvinists so continually inculcate, rather than to the impressions which they were calculated to make on mankind. Mr. J. supposes "that the sacrifices were designed to lead the offerer to consider the evil of his ways:" I supposed this very same end to have been

designed by our Lord's death, and to have been the source of its atoning virtue. Not that I presumed that the whole efficacy of his death turned on this point: I only proposed it as one very intelligible part of it; for more may be yet concealed behind the impenetrable veil which hides the spiritual world. After this explanation, I trust that Mr. Jevans will suppose that there is nothing in my views materially differing from his own, or which deserves his reprobation.

In reply to your Correspondent F. B. [p. 552], I will first endeavour to point out the peculiarities which distinguish the high Calvinistic atonement, or rather satisfaction, from the doctrine which I meant to defend. It rests, I conceive, on a peculiar hypothesis, on which the other does not rest in *any the least* degree. That hypothesis is this; that the nature of the Divine justice is such, that when once a sin is committed, the full punishment of that sin must inevitably be inflicted, no other remission being possible than that of substituting an innocent person in the place of the guilty: thus that the justice of God is as an unrelenting creditor, who will be paid the uttermost farthing, though, indeed, he is not so careful by whom that payment is made. Furthermore, as the same party contends that the guilt of sin is infinite, so it follows that for the least offence, an infinite punishment or an infinite satisfaction becomes immediately inevitable; which amounts to this, that if any creature should sin, either the Deity himself must bear the punishment, or that creature must suffer everlasting and infinite torment. This is, strange to say, the popular doctrine: in this, but a few years ago, as F. B. says of himself, I was a devout believer; but so repugnant does it now appear to me to Scripture and every endearing view of God; so does it mar the fair face of creation, and turn the universe into one house of mourning, that I could not think of defending any doctrine involving such principles. My aim is of a far simpler kind: it does not belong to me, if it does to any man, to invent hypotheses and frame systems on such subjects as these: and if I attempted to bring forward any new or subtle

explanations, I should stand convicted of palpable folly. My view regards no more than the plain connexion of two great events; it is more of an historical than doctrinal complexion, according in this with that fine remark, "that Christianity is a religion of facts." The two facts are, first, the sufferings and death of our Lord Jesus Christ; secondly, those privileges and blessings which were conferred on mankind by his resurrection; or, in other words, that forgiveness of sins which we receive in him. Before I go further I would observe, that this forgiveness of sins, which we thus receive, is by no means to be confounded with that general favourable disposition, with which a penitent is always regarded by God: I am not for adopting the strange language of those who speak of the death of Christ as giving efficacy to repentance; let us not judge by supposed cases, but by the real facts—the facts which the gospel records and predicts, and no others. These facts may be briefly stated: our Lord Jesus, being without sin, suffered and died; that is the first: the second is, that having risen again, he has brought life and immortality to light, and is exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to his people, and remission of sins. Now the question relates to the dependence of the latter of these events on the former, and may be stated thus: Does not the Scripture represent the former of these events as appointed by the Divine wisdom to prepare the way for the latter, and that in consideration of mankind being sinners; and the latter event involving the forgiveness of their sins? I must leave this question, Sir, with F. B. and your readers—we cannot all see things alike; but to my mind the answer shines unambiguous with the clear and steady light of truth. I will not trouble you now with texts; I think there is none clearer or stronger than the simple statement, that "Jesus died for our sins." I care little about the word atonement, or any other theological phrase; only let such expressions as that just quoted, be used as freely and fearlessly as they are in the New Testament, and I shall desire no more. The connexion between the steps of our redemption, as pointed out in

Scripture, should not be lost sight of or lightly regarded; for, no doubt, to bear it in mind concerns both our holiness and our comfort.

F. B. considers the atonement as turning on the Deity of Christ; in answer, I avail myself of the words of an able defence of Unitarians, lately published. (Appeal to Scripture and Tradition, p. 140.) It is there said, "The atonement is commonly thought to be interwoven with the divinity of Christ, but erroneously. The atonement, or propitiation, does not of itself prove Christ's divinity or his super-angelic nature: the *simple humanity* of Christ's nature *does not of itself disprove the atonement.*" The Jewish sacrifices were atonements in the appointed cases; Job's offering was an atonement for his friends; an act of Phinehas made atonement for the whole people of Israel: why then should an Unitarian think the mediation of the Lord Jesus an insufficient atonement for the sins of the whole world? These things do not depend on weight and measure, but on the good pleasure of the only wise God. The question is simply, "Cui dabit partes scelus expiandi?"

THOMAS FOSTER BARHAM.

London,
December 1, 1819.

SIR,

HAVING been repeatedly told that I ought to have taken some notice of Mr. Procter's letter, which appeared in the Monthly Repository for November, 1818, p. 688, respecting the state of sundry Presbyterian Chapels in the county of Stafford; and observing that the subject is again alluded to in your last Number, at p. 673, I now send you such information as I am in possession of, respecting the one at Newcastle-under-Line, and hope that this may induce some other persons to furnish you with similar communications from Stone and Stafford.

Twenty-five years ago, the Old Presbyterian Chapel at Newcastle was used regularly for public worship, and though the congregation was small, some of the most respectable people in the town and neighbourhood belonged to it. By the death of a gentleman of great opulence and considerable consequence in the county

of Stafford, which happened in the beginning of the year 1795, the number of the trustees of the chapel was reduced to three, and in consequence of this a new trust, comprising the principal people of the congregation, was formed, and the deed was executed before the expiration of that year.

Notwithstanding this had been effected, several members of the congregation left the chapel immediately afterwards, in consequence of the minister having contracted habits of intemperance; and from that time other persons left it by degrees, until the place was entirely deserted. The building was then let to the members of the Established Church for a school, and was occupied by them for many years; during which time it suffered very shameful dilapidation, and became unfit for a place of public worship.

I was, however, surprised a few months ago at being applied to as one of the trustees, respecting an intended revival of the old interest, and craving my co-operation and assistance. Since then, I am informed that some of the old members have obtained possession of the building, and that the roof was taken off, only about a fortnight ago, preparatory to its undergoing a thorough repair; and that the Presbyterian body at Newcastle are determined to exert themselves to render the chapel comfortable, and to procure, as soon as possible, a regular minister. But as their numbers are small, and the expenses of repairing the building will be very considerable, I believe they do not expect to realize their intentions without the assistance of other congregations.

S. P.

Walthamstow,
Sia, December 4, 1819.

ALLOW me to join Mr. Howe, [p. 661,] in recommending to the attention of our Unitarian friends the Society for the Relief of Aged and Infirm Dissenting Ministers. For what reasons they have hitherto been backward upon this occasion, I have no right to inquire. But if there are any who think that it will wound the

VOL. XIV.

5 D

feelings of ministers in distress to be relieved by this Society, I can only say, that to me this apprehension appears altogether groundless. It will not, I conceive, wound any man's feelings to receive assistance from a fund which was not raised in consideration of his individual case, but with a prospective view to the case of all who should be circumstanced as he is; nor will any man be ashamed to acknowledge himself poor, whose profession has been known to exclude the means of rising above poverty. The situation of Dissenting Ministers, who are solely or chiefly dependent upon the emoluments of their profession, does not appear to me to have been sufficiently considered. Their sensibilities are commonly somewhat refined by education; their office introduces them to the intimacy of men comparatively rich, and thus they contract a familiarity with the comforts and accommodations of what are called easy circumstances; the whole of their active life is not unfrequently one continued struggle with difficulties; and, at length, when overtaken by age and infirmity, they may, without any fault of their own, be thrown upon the support of precarious charity. Surely, to men thus circumstanced it will be cheering and consolatory to find that, while they are labouring to promote the best interests of mankind, the peculiarities of their condition are not overlooked, but that the more wealthy part of the Dissenting community are cheerfully contributing to a society, which has for its object the support and comfort of their declining years. It will be to them a delightful argument that they have not laboured in vain in inculcating the lessons of that Master, who left it as his last injunction to his followers, that they should love one another. What objections of any weight can be urged against the Institution in question, I am unable to conceive. But I shall, I trust, be excused if I remark, that those reasonings ought to be founded on clear and certain principles, which are allowed to stop the hand of charity. Benevolence may, indeed, be exercised indiscreetly; but it is better for a man's self that it should be indiscreetly exercised, than that it should

be checked by scrupulous and, perhaps, mistaken calculations of the good or evil by which its exercise might be followed. But no imaginable evil, that I can see, can possibly result from any support which is likely to be given to the Society for which Mr. Howe is pleading, and for which I sincerely hope that he may not plead in vain.

E. COGAN.

SIR,
THE respect I have entertained for your Correspondent Mr. Luckcock led me to expect from him rather an apology for his hasty accusation of Mr. Russell, the Resident at Hyderabad, than a vindication of it; rather a frank acknowledgment of having precipitately, I will not say "twisted," but, mistaken, the import of the quoted extract from his dispatch, than a perseverance in imputing to that gentleman sentiments and feelings disgraceful to humanity, and neither expressed nor implied in the voucher produced for them. I will notice very briefly what Mr. L. has farther advanced, (p. 686,) and, to save time, in the order of its arrangement. Mr. L. observes, "*I merely said*, 'It does not appear that Mr. Russell had any hand in this work of blood; but it gives him unmixed pleasure, without a particle of regret or commiseration.'"
Merely this! But, even this is begging the very question; for it is not deducible from the extract, that the murder of the Arabs was a source of either pleasure or pain to Mr. Russell, whose duty it was to state the circumstance, and which he has done "simply and drily." Mr. L. adds, "That the word '*pleasure*' [not applied to the miserable fate of the garrison] should be so conspicuous, without an iota of palliative, is a sufficient presumption that he sat down with feelings of exultation, untempered by the humanity which the case so strongly called for." This is, indeed, a sufficient presumption! somewhat similar, in common parlance, to making bad worse. But, is Mr. L. to be informed that the introduction of an "*iota of palliative*," or of the minutest observation upon the massacre into Mr. Russell's official dispatch, would have

been liable to animadversion as an obtrusive impertinence, and, perhaps, to censure as a departure from his province? Was it for him, in his station, to insinuate any disapprobation, or any private opinion, of the military operations which it devolved upon him to transmit an account of?

Mr. L. has incautiously drawn a bitter inference from premises that fail him, and, instead of handsomely retracting it, would support it by a *paraphrase*! He then appals us by bringing the probable circumstances of the tragedy before our eyes, as though I had inclined to palliate it; and spends his eloquence in arraignment of the system (which he does not charge me with advocating) that engenders such proceedings; all which has as much to do with the point at issue between him and me, as the battle of the frogs and mice. My unshaken position is, that Mr. Russell's communication intimated no sentiment or feeling of any description upon the event so justly deplored; and, therefore, Mr. L. has suffered himself to publish an unwarranted imputation upon a gentleman some thousand miles absent; which it was the purpose of my "*pitiful cavil*," or appeal to the plain sense of a document, (your readers will judge whether) to repeal.

But, is it true (I do not ask it offensively) that Mr. L. had *merely said* what he has quoted from himself? Is it nothing, speculating on Mr. Russell's undeclared sentiments, to have dragged him, in the face of his country, to the bar of final retribution as a culprit, abstaining only in words from anticipating the sentence of the divine assessor on his imputed delinquency?

Mr. L. has *merely* gone this length; and, to redeem Mr. Russell from such a woeful predicament, have I volunteered myself in your pages, I hope not intemperately. I have done with the subject, Sir, only remarking that Mr. L. has called to my recollection the old ballad of Katherine Hays, who had as little mercy on her husband, as he on Mr. Russell,

"And, finding no hole in his coat,
She picked one in his skull."

BREVIS.

The Nonconformist.

No. XV.

(Concluded from p. 685.)

On the Sentiments of the early Continental Reformers respecting Religious Liberty.

THE specimens already given must suffice of the sentiments of the Lutheran school on religious liberty. The opinions held by the Reformers of Switzerland come next to be considered. At the head of these stands Zuinglius, whose labours were contemporary with those of Luther, though they acted wholly independently of each other. Zuinglius wrote a treatise on the Office of the Magistrate: but though in this work he assigns to the magistrate the duty of preserving and protecting the Church, and states several things about punishing certain offenders capitally, he never drops the least hint of his right or duty to put reputed heretics to death. His language would, on the contrary, rather seem to imply that he considered him not to be invested with the power of the sword in such cases. "The obedience," he observes, "which is due to magistrates should by no means be carried so far, nor has God committed to them such power, as that they should rule the minds and consciences of men." * And again, "God has ordained that we should be obedient to magistrates, who bear the sword committed to them, in those things which relate to the intercourse of life, to business, friendship and society; but," he adds, "let not the magistrate punish any other offence which relates to the internal consciences of men, for the judgment of these things is in the hand of God." †

* "Nequaquam autem, ea quæ illis (Magistratibus) debetur obedientia tam procul extenditur, nec tantum potestatis ipsis divinitus commissum est, ut in animas quoque et conscientias hominum dominentur, et imperent." Minus Celsus, ut supra, fol. 116, b.

† "Deus enim oportet, nos esse subditos Magistratui, qui gladium sibi commissum gestat, in hisce rebus nimirum quæ vita conversationem, commercia, amicitias, sodalitias, adeoque ipsam vitam hanc corporalem affinem, et ad humanæ justitiam leges,

Zuinglius was succeeded in the Church of Zurich by Bullinger, a man of great talents, and a zealous promoter of the Reformation. Bullinger is thought to have maintained in some of his earlier works, that errors in opinion should be wholly left to the Divine judgment: but if this be the case, his ideas at a later period were very different. "There are," he remarks, "some blasphemies, so impious and horrible, that they cannot even be heard, much less be tolerated; some which tend directly and openly to the subversion of the state, unless they be suppressed in time." "Those who pertinaciously err, who labour to draw others with them into error, and to keep them in their mistakes; blasphemers, disturbers, and subverters of the Church, may lawfully be put to death." *

The opinion expressed by this writer concerning the fate of Servetus, will both illustrate his sentiments upon religious liberty, and shew the temper and spirit with which he regarded those who dissented from the popular creed. "Servetus," he writes, "was indeed burnt at Geneva, but not without the advice of the other Evangelical Churches of the Helvetic Republic, to the most honourable Senate of Geneva, which had applied for their opinion. For many ages there have not been seen blasphemies so foul, atrocious, monstrous and abominable against the Divine Majesty, and the purity of the true faith, as this most filthy monster of a man, and disgraceful wretch, has published in a printed work, and has impiously,

et prescriptum possunt referri." "Nec ullum aliud facinus persequetur, quod internam hominis conscientiam spectat; horum enim iudicia in manu Dei sunt." Minus Celsus, fol. 117, a.

* "Sunt quædam adeò blasphema, impia et indigna ut ne audiri quidem, nesciunt possint. Sunt quæ rectæ et palam tendant in subversionem Reipublicæ, nisi in tempore sopiantur."

"Pertinaciter errantes, et alios secum in errorem abducere, inque erroribus retinere contendentes, blasphemi, et perturbatores imò subversores ecclesiarum jure cœdi possunt." Vide Beza, de Hæreticis à Civili Magistratu puniendis Libel. (8vo. 1554,) pp. 265, 266.

wantonly and pertinaciously defended even to his death. For whatever he had for about twenty-five years, imbibed from all the schools of the Jews and Turks, whatever also he had collected from the execrable blasphemies of heretics, or from the infernal sinks and sewers, he has transfused into his book, and presented as a Circean, or rather Tartarean, cup to the people and nations. But all laws, as well divine as human, of emperors, princes, states and people in their right mind, command that blasphemies should be punished. This, when the most honourable Senate of Geneva did in virtue of its sacred office, it did what it ought."*

From Zurich we proceed to Geneva,—where the conduct of Calvin, in instituting the proceedings against Servetus, and aiding in bringing him to the stake, leaves no room for doubt or hesitation as to his sentiments concerning religious liberty. The part which he acted on that occasion he has not blushed to avow, and has vindicated and justified, in an elabo-

* It seems impossible to do justice to the language of the original in a translation. Let the reader, if he so please, make the attempt. "Exustus est quidem Genevæ M. Servetus, sed non citra consilium reliquarum rerum publicarum Helveticarum Evangelium profitentium, ad amplissimum Genevensis Senatum petitum. Et multa jam secula non viderunt unquam adeò fœdas, atroces, prodigiosasque et abominandas in Dei Majestatem fideique veræ sinceritatem blasphemias, atque spurcissimum hoc hominis monstrum propudiunque libro edito in lucem profudit, et in mortem usque impiè, procaciter, et pertinaciter, defendit. Nam quicquid annis plus minus 25 hausit ex omnibus Judæorum et Turcarum scholis, quicquid item ex omnibus hæreticorum execrandis blasphemias, cœu ex sentinis et cloacis infernalibus collegit, hoc totum, transfusum in detestandum opus typis excusum, cœu populum Circum immo Tartareum, populis et gentibus propinavit. Jubent autem omnes leges divinæ pariter et humanæ, Imperatorum, Principum, urbiumque, et populorum saniorum de blasphemis sumere supplicium. Quod cùm amplissimus Genevensis Senatus fecit, pro pio suo officio, quod debuit fecit." Bullinger, in præf. ad Jos. Simleri Lib. iv. de aeterno Dei Filio. Item. Apud Bock, Hist. Antitrib. II. 379.

rate treatise, composed expressly with this view,* and written in a spirit congenial with the deed it attempts to defend. It would seem that Calvin, on his first joining the Reformers, held more tolerant sentiments towards those who differed from him in their religious tenets, than he avowed in the latter part of his life. This appears from a passage in the first edition of his *Institutes*, which was afterwards suppressed or altered.†

* *Defensio Orthodoxæ Fidei de Sacra Trinitate, contra prodigiosos Errores Michaelis Serveti Hispani, ubi ostenditur Hæreticos jure gladii coereendos esse, et nominatum de homine hoc tam impiè, justè et merito sumptum Genevæ fuisse supplicium.* Per J. Calvinum. 8vo. 1554.

† I record this fact on the authority of the Answer to Calvin's book against Servetus, which bears the following title:—"Contra Libellum Calvini in quo ostendere conatur Hæreticos jure gladii coereendos esse." 12mo. 1562. The first edition of the *Institutes* was published at Basil, in 8vo. in 1536. This work was, however, little more than a rough draught of the treatise. The second edition, considerably enlarged, was printed at Strasburgh, in folio, in 1539. It is disputed among Bibliographers, whether the author prefixed his name to this edition. There appears to have been a copy in London bearing his name on the title-page; but there was a copy of the same date in the Library of the Sorbonne at Paris, with the fictitious name of "Alcuinus." It would seem, besides, from the dedication to the London copy, that the name of Alcuinus had been originally prefixed to that also, and that the title-page had been cancelled, in order to insert the name of the author. The dedication begins as follows:—"Potentissimo, Illustrissimoque Monarchæ, Magno Francorum Regi, Principi ac Domino suo, ALCUINUS." See Vogt, *Catalogus Historico-Criticus Librorum Rariorum*, &c. p. 162. As these early editions of Calvin's *Institutes* are of extreme rarity, and as the Answer to his book against Servetus is also scarce, I shall transcribe the passage referred to in the text:

"Qui vero aut nobiscum non consentiunt in eandem fidem, aut etiam si confessionem in labris habent, Deum tamen, quem ore confitentur, operibus abnegant (ut quos videmus in omni vita sceleratos ac perditos, peccandi voluptate ebrios, malisque suis indormientes) hujusmodi omnes suis se inditiis produnt non esse ad præsens ecclesiæ membra. In huic usum

After stating that those who do not agree with us in faith ought only to be excommunicated, and then be "left

constituta sunt excommunicationes, quibus à fidelium consortio abdicarentur atque expellerentur ii, qui fidem Christi falso obtendentes, vita nequitia, effrenaque pecandi licentia nihil aliud sunt quam scandala ecclesiae; ideoque indigni qui Christi nomine glorientur. Primum ne cum Dei contumelia inter Christianos nominentur, ac si sancta ejus ecclesia foret maleficorum et publica improborum hominum coniunctio. Deinde ne frequenti consuetudine alios corruptant perversae vite exemplo. Postremo ut eos ipsos pudore confusos suæ turpitudinis penitentia resipiscere tandem discant. Tales quidem judicare possumus pro tempore ab ecclesia alienos, quantum cernere datur, ac secundum eam quam diximus noticie regulam. Verum ne sic quidem desperandi à nobis sunt, quasi extra manus Dei abjecti, ac omnino nephas quamplam expungere ex electorum numero, aut desperare quasi jam perditum, nisi quos certo constet verbo Dei jam damnatos, ut si quis data opera ac destinata malitia veritatem oppugnet, ut opprimat Evangelium, et nomen Dei extinguat, et Spiritui Sancto resistat. De iis enim jam ore Dei pronunciatum est, cum dixit, non remitti peccatum in Spiritum Sanctum, neque in hoc seculo neque in futuro. Quod raro adeo à nobis sentiri potest (si unquam tamen potest) ut sanioris sit consilii expectare diem revelationis, nec temerè iudicio Dei præire: plus licentiae ne nobis in judicando arrogemus, nisi volumus Dei virtutem limitare, ac misericordiae ejus legem dicere, cui quoties visum est, pessimis in optimos mutantur, alieni inseruntur, extranei cooptantur in ecclesia, ut sic hominum opinionem eludat, et temeritatem retundat, ne sibi judicandi jus supra quam debet usurpare audeant. Danda potius opera, ut mutuo candore alter de altero quam poterit optimè fieri sentiamus; alii aliorum facta et dicta vicissim in optimam partem accipiamus, non, ut suspicaces solent, obliquè ac sinistrè torqueamus. Quod si qui ita perversi sunt ut de se benè sentire non permittant, eos tamen in manum Dei committamus, bonitatique ejus commendemus, meliora de his sperantes, pacem et charitatem alamus, nec stolidè irrumpentes in secretiora Dei judicia, errorum tenebris nos involvamus. Et ut unico verbo absolvam, non personam ipsam, quæ in manu atque arbitrio Dei est in mortem abdicemus, sed tantum qualia sint cuiusque opera testimemus ex lege Dei, quæ boni et mali regula est. In hunc

in the hands of God, and commended to his goodness," he adds, "nor are those persons alone to be thus treated; but Turks also, and Saracens, and other enemies of true religion; so far are those methods from being to be approved, by which men have hitherto attempted to bring them over to their faith, while they have denied them water and fire, and the common elements; have withheld from them all the offices of humanity, and persecuted them with the sword."

The language he employs, in his Treatise on the Punishment of Heretics, is, however, very different. A summary of the sentiments maintained in that work, which sets out with explicitly denying the right of private judgment in religion, is comprised in the following passage:—"We know that there are three degrees of errors: some we allow ought to be pardoned; for others, moderate chastisement should suffice, so that only open impiety ought to be punished with death. Paul repeatedly exhorts believers to bear with one another, although there may be some disagreement among them; that is, if any trifling superstition or weakness have taken hold of the mind of simple persons, they are to endeavour to correct

sensum accipiendæ sunt excommunicationes, non quibus dejiciantur ex spe salutis, qui coram hominibus abdicantur ex ecclesiæ grege, sed ut in viam redeant, quemadmodum Paulus scribit se tradidisse hominem Sathanæ in interitum carnis, ut spiritus salvis fieret in diem Domini, hoc est, (ut ego quidem interpretor,) conjectisse in damnationem temporariam, ut in æternum salvis fieret. Itaque tametsi familiarius versari aut interiorem consuetudinem habere cum excommunicatis per ecclesiasticam disciplinam non licet, debemus tamen contendere quibus possumus modis sive exhortatione ac doctrina, sive clementia ac mansuetudine, sive nostris ad Deum precibus, ut ad meliorem frugem conversi in societatem ac unitatem ecclesie sese recipient. Neque iti modò sic tractandi sunt, sed Turcæ quoque ac Saraceni, cæterique veræ religionis hostes, tantum abest ut probandæ sunt rationes quibus eos ad fidem nostram adigere hactenus moliti sunt, dum aqua et igne, communibusque elementis illis interdicunt, cum omnia illis humanitatis officia denegant, cum ferro et armis persequuntur."

it with patience, rather than be eager to punish it with violence. As to the second kind of error, although it deserves chastisement, it is to be treated nevertheless with moderate severity: only that care must be taken that the wickedness and contumacy of those who are endeavouring to break the unity of faith, be not increased by indulgence. But when religion is overthrown at its foundation, when defestable blasphemies against God are promulgated, and souls are hurried to perdition by impious and pestilent tenets, and when a defection from the one God and his pure doctrine is openly attempted, it becomes necessary to recur to that extreme remedy, lest the deadly poison should spread further."* Quotations need not be multiplied to shew what were Calvin's ideas on this subject. Indeed, to detail them at length, with the reasons by which they are supported, were to transcribe the greater part of this "Golden book," as Beza has designated it. Here then we shall leave him, and proceed to notice his friend Beza, who has stood forward, with a kindred spirit, as his defender and eulogist.

Beza's sentiments are to be seen in many incidental observations in his different publications, but principally in a letter which he addressed to Dudith, and in his celebrated book

* "Scimus enim tres esse errorum gradus: et quibusdam fatemur dandam esse veniam, aliis modicam castigationem sufficere, ut tantum manifesta impietas capitali supplicio plectatur. Fideles st̄p̄ius Paulus hortatur ut se invicem tolerent, quamvis aliqua sit inter eos dissentio: nempe, si qua levis supersticio et insecitia simpliū mentes occupat, ut eam patientia corrigere potius studiant quām intemperanter ad vindictam efferveant. Secundum errorum genus etiā castigationem meretur, mediocris tamen adhibenda est severitas: tantum ne indulgentia alatur eorum improbitas et contumacia qui fidei unitatem scindere cuperent. Sed ubi à suis fundamentis convellitur religio, detestandæ in Deum blasphemiae perforuntur, impiis et pestiferis dogmatibus in exitium rapiuntur animæ, denique ubi palam defectio ab unico Deo, puraque ejus doctrina tentatur, ad extremum illud remedium descendere necesse est, ne mortale venenum longius serpat." *Calvini Defensio Orthod. Fidei, &c.* 8vo. 1554, p. 31.

on the right of the Civil Magistrate to punish Heretics,* a title which has been aptly paraphrased "The right of the Civil Magistrate to be the Church's or the Presbytery's Hangman." In the former work, advertising to a remark of Dudith's that Beza and the Protestants contended that liberty of conscience should be allowed, he thus replies: "By no means, as this liberty is understood, that is, that every man may worship God as he pleases. For it is a mere dogma of devils that any person should, if he wishes, perish. Pastors, therefore, should not only, as far as lies in their power, prevent their sheep from perishing, but should also admonish and chastise them, and at last, if necessary, after other remedies have been tried in vain, drive them from the rest of the flock." "That is a diabolical liberty which at this day fills Poland and Transylvania with so many plagues, which no other region under the sun would tolerate."† But his ideas are developed more at large in the latter publication, wherein he fully explains the policy he would recommend and pursue as the substitute of that "diabolical liberty" of conscience which was so much the object of his abhorrence. It must suffice at present to say of it, without citing the author's words, that he argues at great length, and with much bitterness of language, that heretics may lawfully be put to death, by the civil magistrate, and he refers to the cases of Gentilis and Servetus as in-

* *De Hæreticis à Civili Magistratu puniendis Libellus, adversus Martini Bellii Farraginem, et novorum Academicorum Sectam. Theodoro Beza Vezelio auctore. Oliva Roberti Stephani. 1554. 8vo.*

† "Jactabimusne libertatem conscientiis permittendam esse? Minime, ut hæc quidem libertas intelligitur, id est, ut quo quisque modo volet Deum colat. Est enim hoc merè diabolicum dogma, siendum esse unumquemque ut si volet pereat. Itaque nec pastores ovem patientur perire, quantum in se erit, sed monebunt, corripiunt, ac tandem si opus fuerit, cæteris frustre tentatis remedis à reliquo grege repellent." "Et illa est diabolica libertas, quæ Poloniam et Transylvaniam hodie tot pestibus implevit, quas nullæ alioqui sub sole regiones tolerarent."

stances of the just exercise of this authority.

We have now to state the sentiments of the third class of Reformers, whose opinions it was proposed to consider—those of the Established Church of Holland. A few words will suffice on this head, as these divines, after the example of Baldwin at Wittemberg, have embodied their thoughts on the subject of religious liberty in an academical thesis, proposed, by authority, to be discussed in the theological schools. This curious document they have intituled “A Disputation concerning lawful Homicide.” “In order,” they say, “that it may the better appear what idolater, heretic, and blasphemer is to be adjudged worthy of death, we will give a definition of each.” Accordingly they proceed as follows: “The idolater is deserving of capital punishment who, disregarding admonition, openly, designedly, and obstinately, so as to disturb the church and seduce others, substitutes some ideal object for the one true God, or joining some creature to him, as his companion, worships it with the one God, or who honours the true God alone, but not in that lawful manner prescribed in the Sacred Writings. The heretic is he who, separating himself from the church of which he had before, by an outward profession, declared himself to be a member, maintains an error which is opposed to the foundations of faith, and to the prophetical and apostolical doctrine delivered in the Scriptures, and from which, though often and properly admonished, and convinced from the word of God, both publicly and in private, he refuses to desist; who will not acknowledge the truth revealed in the writings of the apostles and prophets, but rather with invincible and pertinacious impiety rejects it, strives to wound the peace and harmony of the church, and opening the school of his perfidy, both in public and in private, endeavours, as far as he is able, by his writings and speeches, to introduce the faction and gangrene of his pestiferous doctrines into the church, or to cherish it after it has been introduced by others.

“The blasphemer is he who publicly, with deliberate purpose, obstinately disregarding admonition, either

slanderously and contumeliously utters something unbecoming concerning the true God, attributing to him that which does not comport with him, taking away that which does pertain to him, and transferring to a creature that which belongs to God alone; or else by an impious act impedes and tramples upon true divine worship, or endeavours to impede and trample upon it. Whoever,” they add, “is found guilty of either of these crimes, as they are here stated, ought to be punished with death by the magistrate.” *

* *Disputatio de Homicidio legitimo—ad disputandum proposita in Collegio Theologico. Illustrissimis D. D. Ordinum Hollandie et Westphrisie, Anno 1602.*

§ vii. “Quo autem melius constet quinam morte dignus Idololatrica, Hæreticus, Blasphemus sit judicandus, singulorum definitionem proponemus; deinde, qui tales reperiuntur quales descriptio exigit, eos occidendos esse, rationibus ex jure divino humanoque ex saniorum hominum testimonio petitis probabimus.”

§ viii. “Capitali supplicio dignus *Idololatrica* est, qui palam, data opera, neglectis admonitionibus, obstinate ut turbet Ecclesiam, et alios seducat, vice unius veri Dei sicutum aliquem habuerit, aut praeter unum illum, creaturam aliquam ipsi quasi socium adjungens coluerit, aut denique verum quidem Deum solum, sed non legitimo in sacris literis prescripto modo, honoraverit. *Hæreticus* est, qui ab ecclesia, cuius se membrum externa professione antea declaraverit, seipse separans, errorem fundamentis fidei, et Propheticæ Apostolicæque doctrinæ in Scripturis traditæ adversantem tuetur, de quo tamen stepe et rite admonitus convictusque ex verbo Dei, tam publicè quam privatim contemnis admonitionibus non vult desistere, nec veritatem in scriptis Apostolorum et Prophetarum revelatam agnosceret; sed potius invicta et pertinaci impietate ei resistens, ecclesiæ pacem et concordiam lacerare contendit, suæque perfidiae ludum publicè et privatim aperiens, pestiferi dogmatis factionem et gangrenam scriptis concessionibusque suis, quantum in se est, vel in ecclesiam Dei invehere, vel ab aliis invectam sovere. *Blasphemus* est, qui publicè, deliberato animo, neglectis admonitionibus, præfractè, vel maledica lingua, contumeliosè de Deo vero, indignum quipiam effutit, tum tribuendo ei quod ipsi non competit, tum adimendo quod ei proprium est, tum transferendo in creaturam quod est Dei solius, vel factio impio cultum divinum verum impedit, conculeat, aut impedit et conculcare conatur.”

The classes which have been enumerated comprise the three great divisions of Reformers who retained, among other relics of Popery, the doctrine of the Trinity. It would have been easy to swell the extracts with passages from the works of other eminent persons of these schools, especially from those of Brentius, Musculus, Wolfgang Capito, Bucer and Peter Martyr, who all concurred in the sentiments which have been quoted, so far at least as to admit that the civil magistrate might lawfully coerce and punish reputed heretics and blasphemers, who publicly professed and taught their opinions. But the limits of this essay will not allow of quotations from their writings, and they are unnecessary, in such a brief summary, to illustrate the subject.

A compendium of the sentiments of the early Reformers respecting religious liberty would, however, be defective without including the opinions which were held and acted upon by some of the Antitrinitarians of the same period. The persecution of Francis David in Transylvania, requires that some notice should be taken of Blandrata and Faustus Socinus, who are connected with that disgraceful transaction, either as instigators or abettors. Of Blandrata it will be sufficient to state, that the whole of the proceedings against David had his approbation, and were, most probably, planned and conducted by him. That Socinus countenanced the prosecution, so far at least as related to the deposition and imprisonment of the venerable superintendent, must be received as matter of authentic history.* It is further evident, that in doing this he acted in conformity with his principles, it being his declared opinion, that, in certain cases, men might lawfully be restrained by the civil power. Writing

to Martin Vadovitz, a professor in the Academy of Cracow, and alluding to some persecution he had experienced, he thus expresses himself:—“ But you will ask, Why do you affirm, that although you were an Heresiarch, and an obstinate one, you ought not to have been treated with this great severity? I answer, because when there is a freedom from sedition, and the pursuit of self-interest, then the Heresiarch does not labour under a fault of the will, but of the understanding. Therefore, as we restrain, and, if it be necessary, confine in thains, mad and frantic persons who would otherwise be injurious to others, and at the same time greatly pity them; so an Heresiarch of this sort ought not to be treated with the utmost severity, but should meet with pity: and the only thing to be regarded is, to hinder his endeavours to propagate his doctrine, and if it cannot be otherwise done, by chains and a prison.” *

The preceding statements are taken from the writings and conduct of persons of the first celebrity in their respective communions, and may be regarded as the standard of opinion on the subject of religious liberty in the several countries in which they resided. It must not be concluded, however, that these views were held universally among the friends and promoters of the Reformation. There is abundant evidence to prove that sentiments far more just and liberal were embraced and avowed in the same period, by persons of distinguished learning and character. This may fairly be inferred from the general feeling of disapprobation which the proceedings against Servetus excited throughout Europe, and the necessity under which Calvin and his associates found themselves of entering upon an elaborate defence of their conduct. But, in addition to this, it is to be observed, that several very able works appeared shortly after this atrocious murder, reprobating the whole transaction in the strongest terms, and maintaining the most enlarged principles of religious freedom. In the number of these may be first

* For a detailed account of the proceedings relative to Francis David, the reader is referred to Dr. Thomas Rees's *Historical Introduction to his Translation of the Racovian Catechism*, pp. xlv. &c. The conduct of Socinus, in this persecution, has been considered, and the charges preferred against him, have been stated and examined, by the writer of the present essay, in the *Nonconformist*, No. V. *Mon. Repos.* XIII. 382, &c.

* Toulmin's *Life of Socinus*, pp. 104, 105. *Socini Opera*, I. 476, b.

mentioned the work, purporting to be the compilation of Martin Bellius, to which Beza's treatise is professedly an answer; a work, of which it may be conjectured, from his manner of speaking of him, that Beza knew the author.* Another work appeared, anonymously, about the same period, under the title of "An Answer to Calvin's Book, in which he endeavours to shew that Heretics may be lawfully put to Death."† The

writer's plan is first to give Calvin's own words, dividing his work into sections, and then to answer these sections, *seriatim*. At the end are appended some smaller pieces relating to the same subject. This is a very masterly performance. It has been ascribed severally to Castalio and Lælius Socinus. The internal evidence appears decisive against the former conjecture: the latter is most probably correct.* After this appeared an elaborate and able treatise against the capital punishment of heretics, which has also been attributed to both Castalio and Lælius Socinus, but which bears on the title page the name of the real author, Minus Celsus, a native of Sienna, and one of the early Italian Antitrinitarians.†

* "De Hæreticis, an sint persequendi, et omnino quo modo sit cum eis agendum, doctorum Virorum tum veterum, tum recentiorum Sententiae. Liber hoc tam turbulento tempore pernecessarius, et cum omnibus, tum potissimum Principibus et Magistratibus utissimus, ad discendum, quodnam sit eorum in re tam controversa, tamque periculosa officium." Magdeburgi, 1554. The contents are, "1. Martini Bellii præfacio, in qua quid sit hæreticus, et quidnam cum eo agendum sit, demonstratur. 2. Aretii Cathari sententia, in qua apertè ostenditur hæreticorum punitionem ad magistratum non pertinere. 3. Joannis Wittlingii de Anabaptistis, et cæteris qui hæretici habentur sententia, quæ idem docet. 4. Aliorum Authorum, tum veterum, tum recentiorum eadem de re sententiae. 5. Basilii Montfortii refutatio eorum, quæ pro persecutione dici solent."

Bock (Hist. Antitrin. Vol. II. p. 639) states that Beza, in his Life of Calvin, attributes it to Lælius Socinus; but on referring to that work it will be seen that he expressly ascribes it to Castalio. His words are, "Celuy-*ei* (Sebastien Chastillon) qui auoit tousiours teuu de la perfection Anabaptistique mais secretelement et entre les siens, ne faisant au surplus difficulte de s'accommoder à chacun, estant aussi grandement irrité de la mort de Servet, se descouurit ouvertement, premierement en un liure qu'il fit imprimer en Latin et en François, sous un faux nom de Martin Bellie: aux erreurs et blasphemies duquel ie respondi lors." "L'Historie de la Vie et Mort de seu Mr. Jean Calvin, &c. Par Theodore de Beza. A Geneve, 1663." 12mo, p. 79.

† "Contra libellum Calvini in quo ostendere conatur Hæreticos jure Gladii coercendos esse." The first edition of this very scarce work was printed in 1554. It was reprinted in Holland in 1612, according to Sandius, but according to Vogt, in 1662. This difference respecting the date has probably been occasioned by the manner in which it is printed on the title page, which is as follows—MDLCXII; but may not this be read 1562? Sandius

(Biblio. Antitrin. p. 20) calls this "a dialogue between Calvin and Vaticanus." But this is not correct. It assumes the dialogue form to the eye, from the extracts from Calvin's book, having his name prefixed to them, and the answers to them being headed "Vaticanus." This work is referred to by Mosheim, in his Life of Servetus, under the following title: "Dissertatio, qua disputatur quo jure quoque fructu Hæretici sunt coercendi Gladio vel Igne, vel Dialogus inter Calvinum et Vaticanum." Vogt, ut supra, p. 164.

* Bock, following Mosheim, declares himself of opinion that it was written by neither Castalio nor L. Socinus. Hist. Antitrin. Vol. II. p. 639.

† In Hæreticis coercendis quatenus pro-gredi licet: Mini Celsi Senensis Disputatio. Ubi nominatim eos ultimo supplicio affici non debere apertè demonstratur. Christlingæ, 1577. This work afterwards appeared under the following title: Mini Celsi Senensis, de Hæreticis Capitali Supplicio non afficiendis. Adjunctæ sunt ejusdem Argumenti Theodori Bezae et Andreæ Duditii Epistolæ duas contrarie, &c. 1584. The extracts from this work given in the preceding pages, are transcribed from this edition which is the only one in my possession. There is a copy of the first edition in the British Museum. On collating the two editions I perceive that the body of the work, as far as the signature *h*, or p. 224, is identically the same in both, having the same typographical errata. The only part of the original work that appears to have been actually reprinted is that comprised in pp. 224—230. To the second edition are added the letters of Beza and Dudith, and the original preface has been exchanged

Though Faustus Socinus has expressed himself as averse to unrestrained Christian freedom, the Unitarians of that period are not to be considered as equally narrow in their sentiments. It would be no difficult task to produce passages from their writings which breathe a spirit of liberality worthy of the cause in which they stood forward so honourably as advocates and confessors.* But exclusively of incidental expressions which lie scattered in their publications, there exist two works in which the subject is professedly treated, and in which their sentiments are fully explained and openly asserted. The first, in order of time, is a tract, intituled *Vindiciae pro Religionis Libertate*, bearing on the title the name of Junius Brutus, but which was really written by John Crellius.† The immediate object of the author is to shew that the Catholic government might safely grant full liberty of worship to the Unitarians as long as they conducted themselves peaceably. The work was written in consequence of the attempts that were making by the Catholics of Poland to subject the Unitarians in that country to some severe restrictive measures. The other is an anonymous

for a dedicatory epistle from "Valens Titus Ligius" to "Christophorus Cnepius Saxonius."

Schelhorn seems now to be considered as having set the question to rest concerning the author of this book. In his "Amoenitates Literarie," Vol. VII. p. 86, he ascribes it to Minus Celsus, whom he shews to have been a person of some note in Italy among the literati of his time. See also Vogt, p. 187; Bock, Vol. II. p. 641; Zeltner's Notes to Ruarus's Epistles, p. 186.

* See particularly the admirable preface of A. Wissowatius, J. Stegman, to the Racovian Catechism, on "The Liberty of Prophesying." Rees's Racovian Catechism, pp. xcv. &c.

† Bock, Vol. I. p. 149. "That Crellius was the author of this work (which some have doubted) is proved by the MS. acts of the Synod, held at Racov in 1635, when it was ordered that Ruarus should take measures to have Crellius's book on the Maintenance of Peace and Faith towards Heretics (which is certainly the same work) printed in other countries." It is inserted in the folio edition of the collected works of Crellius, in the Bibliothe. Frat. Polon. Vol. III. p. 521.

piece composed by Schlichtingius, and intituled *Apologia pro Veritate accusata*. It was addressed "to the States of Holland and West Frisia," in consequence of a decree passed by them against the Unitarians, in September 1639, and the applications of the ecclesiastical authorities to the magistrates to enact against them laws of still greater severity.* In both these tracts the fullest liberty of conscience is contended for by the illustrious authors.

From the representations which have now been made, a tolerably correct estimate may be formed of the sentiments of the early Continental Reformers on the subject of Religious Liberty. It is painful to observe that so many of those eminent persons, who have so well merited the applause of mankind by their honourable and successful stand against the tyrannical usurpations of the Church of Rome, should have admitted into their minds principles so hostile to the just rights of conscience, and so inconsistent with the conduct they had themselves pursued. In forming our estimate of their character, it is, however, but fair to grant them the full benefit of that equitable law, which requires that men should be judged by the principles of their times. Great allowance ought, no doubt, to be made for the circumstances in which they were placed, and the difficulties they had to encounter. It would, perhaps, be expecting too much from human nature were we to look for the most correct and enlarged sentiments on religious freedom from persons who had been nursed in the cradle of intolerance, and accustomed to bend their minds with implicit submission to the will of their spiritual superiors. But the largest concessions which justice and candour can demand for them will not go the full length of their justification in the intolerant and persecuting measures to which they too frequently resorted. Least of all will it allow that the bitter animosity, the cool, steady and relentless spirit of vengeance, with which, in some instances, they pursued men, for a mere difference of opinion, to the block and the

* Bock, Vol. I. p. 815.

stake, should be passed over, in any age, without reprobation.

Let it be considered, however, that whatever apology their circumstances may plead for the narrow views of religious liberty entertained by the early Reformers, and the persecutions into which their principles betrayed them, no excuse of a similar kind can justify or even palliate the same principles and conduct in the present age. Thanks to the ameliorating influence of Christianity, which has been silently and gradually, but, at the same time, effectually improving the human heart, and correcting the institutions of civil society, it is now no longer a question to be argued, at least among Protestants, whether it be lawful to put reputed heretics to death. Let it be hoped that the time is not far distant when it will also be deemed absurd and monstrous, a gross violation of Christian freedom, and of the rights of human nature, to subject men to any degree of inconvenience and suffering, to civil disabilities and penalties, for the opinions they may conscientiously hold on the subject of religion.

It may be remarked, in conclusion, that the first and fatal error of the early Reformers, and the cause of all their subsequent mistakes concerning religious liberty, was to ally religion with the state, and call in the aid of the civil magistrate to maintain their creed and worship. This should operate as a warning and admonition to after times. For it is not too much to say, that perfect freedom, which is every man's birthright, will in vain be hoped for until religion shall have been repudiated from her unholy union with political authority; until she shall be permitted to stand and to rule independent and alone; swaying her mild sceptre with all her native grace and benignity, inspiring every breast with love, and diffusing around universal harmony and peace.

R. S.

Sir,

As the names of two of my most intimate friends, who cannot now answer for themselves, are mentioned in your very valuable Repository, (p. 658,) I think it a duty incumbent on me to state the fact more correctly than it is there given. In speaking of the Unitarian Society

established for the circulation of Books, it is said, that in the original formation of the Society the word "idolatrous" occasioned considerable discussion. The adoption of it, according to the statement of the writer, who represents himself as the originator of the Society, "cost the Society several of its most respectable members, and particularly the whole body of Unitarians then existing in the University of Cambridge, amongst whom were Mr. Jones, the late celebrated tutor of Trinity, and Mr. Tyrwhitt, of Jesus College." Mr. Jones had been my private tutor, and we ever after lived on most intimate terms of friendship, of which a public testimonial was given in the University, and it will never be erased from my mind. In a similar manner I was connected with Mr. Tyrwhitt, with whom I was particularly intimate for the greater part of the time that I was a resident member of Jesus College, and afterwards our intercourse was kept up by letter and occasional visits to the University. I might add here that his friendship to me was marked at his death by the kind notice taken of me in his will.

I remember perfectly well our secession from the Unitarian Society for the distribution of Books, and I can confidently state that my two friends above-mentioned and myself left it on other grounds besides those stated in your Repository. I have not before me the prospectus which was then in our hands, but I recollect thus much, that it did not agree with the views which we entertained of our Saviour's character. We certainly did object to the term *idolatrous*, not only because we thought it not a proper term to be used, when it is strictly analyzed, but also because it was an offensive term, and introduced without any necessity.

Mr. Tyrwhitt retained the same opinion to his death, and I have not altered mine. In some of your preceding Numbers I have given my reasons for differing from Mr. Belsham in his definition of Unitarians: and, according to his description of them, Mr. Tyrwhitt and myself are equally excluded from belonging to that body. Indeed, Mr. Tyrwhitt would have expressed himself with some degree of indignation, if, because he was an

Unitarian in the true sense of the word, the dogmas of Mr. Belsham annexed to it were supposed to be part of his creed.

Mr. Belsham has certainly a right to use words in what sense he pleases; but it does not follow, that the sense he chooses to give it is the true sense of the word. He may say, if he pleases, that he is an Unitarian, and nobody else is an Unitarian but who believes according to his standard of faith. That may be the law for those within his pale :

Illi se jactet in aula
Eolus.

There is and will be, I am persuaded, a body of Unitarians, however small, who will be contented with the short creed given by our Master: "This is life eternal to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent :" and to all who hold this faith they will be happy in holding out the right hand of fellowship, though they may entertain very different opinions on certain points, which Mr. Belsham lays down as essential to Unitarianism. In this small number I profess to be.

W. FREND.

—

Bristol,

December 8, 1819.

SIR,
MR. BELSHAM'S communication, respecting the proceedings at the last annual meeting of the *Western Unitarian Society*, appears to me to require some notice on the part of those who supported the alteration to which he refers.

As a part of my case, I must beg you to insert the Notice which was given of the approaching Meeting in your Number for June [p. 396].

" Agreeably to the resolutions of the General Meeting of 1818, it will be referred to the ensuing Meeting, to consider the propriety of altering that part of the Preamble which relates to the doctrinal principles on which the Society is founded, so as to open it to all who worship the Father as the only true God, and worship him alone.

" The part of the Preamble referred to is as follows: '—declaring it to be the fundamental principle of the Society, in which we all agree, that there is but one God, the Creator and Governor of the universe, without an equal or a vicegerent, the only proper object of religious wor-

ship; and that Jesus Christ was the most eminent of those messengers which he has employed to reveal his will to mankind, possessing extraordinary powers similar to those received by other prophets, but in a much higher degree.'"

On this Notice I have only to observe, that the Resolution at Ilminster was expressed more loosely, *to include Unitarians of every description*; and that it was directed to be inserted in the Catalogues, and I think in the Monthly Repository; but that the above Notice was sent when the writer was from home, and he had no document to refer to.

To explain the share which I took in the proposed alteration, I must be indulged in a retrospective detail.

About the time when the W. U. S. was to be held in Exeter, (1811, when Mr. Kentish delivered his excellent discourse on the *Connection between the Simplicity of the Gospel, and the Leading Doctrines of the Protestant Cause*,) its exclusive constitution formed the subject of discussion. Some, who on the ground of Christian duty united with us in the Exclusive Worship of God even the Father, and in the close bonds of Christian communion, and were very solicitous to promote, and to see promoted, the great principles which separate the Unitarian from the worship and communion of every other body of Christians, felt painfully that the limiting restriction of our Preamble prevented them from uniting with us in our exertions; which, but for that profession or test, they could conscientiously have done. I represented that the expression respecting the person of Christ was worded so generally, that some who did not believe in the Simple Humanity, had felt themselves at liberty to join us. The answer was, If the expression is not *designed* to exclude the believer in the Pre-existence, why not make it less definite? I was myself satisfied that by the original constitution of the Society, it was so designed; but I saw no reason why it should be so limited, as to exclude those whom Mr. Belsham himself allowed to be Unitarians. And if it could not be so far altered, my own wish was, that it should be made more definite.

On conferring with the two friends whose opinions were likely to decide

the question,—the able Preacher of the year, and my present highly-respected Colleague, (both of whom had been among the earliest supporters of the Society, and to the latter of whom it was under constant obligations for his judicious and zealous attention to its concerns,)—I found it met, so decidedly and unhesitatingly, with their disapprobation, that the question was not publicly agitated: and there the matter dropped.

Near the close of the year 1813, my friend Mr. Worsley, of Plymouth, communicated to me his conviction, that as the seat of the W. U. S. was so remote from the western part of Devon, and from Cornwall, it would promote the local interests of Unitarianism, if an Association for Devon and Cornwall was formed, upon a plan similar to that of the W. U. S., and which might be open to those who were not disposed to contribute so much as the subscription of the parent Society. I agreed with him on the desirableness of the plan, provided we adopted as the basis, that "*God, even the Father, is the Only True God, the Primary Source of all the blessings we enjoy through Christ Jesus, and the Only Proper Object of Religious Worship.*" This was agreed to. The first meeting of the Devon and Cornwall Unitarian Association, was held at Plymouth, in 1814, when 134 joined us, chiefly from those who had not before been connected with any other Unitarian Society;* and our venerable and pious advocate, Dr. Toulmin, preached before the new Association, the sermon which he afterwards delivered before the W. U. S. at Yeovil. The two Societies had a common and most harmonious meeting at Exeter, in the year 1817, when Mr. John Kenrick delivered that masterly discourse, entitled *Unitarianism the Essence of Vital Christianity*, with which most of your readers must be well acquainted.—At a previous meeting of the W. U. S. at Bristol, 1815, when Mr. Fox delivered his eloquent and interesting *Reply to Popular Ob-*

jections against Unitarianism, some allusion was made, in the Report of the Committee, to a diminution of numbers caused by the establishment of the Devon and Cornwall Association; and it was stated in reply, that for every one that was lost, several were gained to the open avowal of the great principles of Unitarianism, and active exertions for the dissemination of them. The conversation at that time, respecting the basis of the Association, led Mr. Fox to say (to the best of my recollection) that he was not aware he had been preaching before a Society which made the doctrine of Simple Humanity an essential point of Unitarianism; and that he could not be a member of any Society which made it an *exclusive* bond of union.*

I do not recollect any thing more connected with the subject, till the spring of 1818, when Mr. Rowe received information from Mr. Fawcett, of Yeovil, that it was wished by some to propose at the ensuing meeting of the W. U. S. at Ilminster, an alteration in the Preamble of the Society, in order to open the door for the admission of those Unitarians who were now excluded. We could neither of us conveniently attend the meeting; but seeing in Exeter a friend who proposed going, I requested him to suggest to the meeting, that, as the subject was an important one, and few comparatively would be present, if it were moved at all, it should merely be to resolve that the question should be discussed at the next annual meeting. This suggestion was adopted. At the Ilminster meeting Mr. Yates of Birmingham was present; and the Members urged him to undertake the office of Preacher for the ensuing year: but he declined; and he was understood to state, that he could not be the Preacher of a Society which, from the then somewhat unsettled state of his mind on

* I trust that Mr. Fox and another of our ablest advocates, whom I shall soon have to mention, will excuse my adverting to their opinions. These assisted in deciding my mind, as to the course I should pursue on the question. They may have seen good reason to change them; and I am sure they ought to change them, if they have seen such reason.

* It was explicitly laid down as a principle, that "*union with this Association shall in no way imply approbation of all the books which may be admitted into the Catalogue.*"

the subject of the Pre-existence, he could not join as a Member.*

As the subject was publicly brought before the Society, I was solicitous that it should be fully discussed and laid to rest one way or other; and I more than once expressed, in our Committee meetings, my intention of delivering my sentiments at the annual meeting. I conceived that however expedient it might have been, when the Society was first instituted to make the avowal of the Simple Humanity an essential feature, (since, at that time, the Arians, however near in sentiment, were almost as much opposed to the believers of the Simple Humanity, and as much afraid of them, as the Trinitarians themselves were, and generally speaking were in no way disposed to unite with them in public efforts to oppose even the great errors of modern orthodoxy,) yet that the time is come, when the middle wall of separation, *in spirit and mutual co-operation*, ought to be broken down: that the great distinction now is, between the Trinitarian and the avowed Unitarian: that there is at least one doctrine, on which the believers of the Simple Humanity differ, which is vastly more momentous than that on which they agree, and in which most of the believers in the Simple Pre-existence, unite with the bulk of those who reject the Pre-existence,—the doctrine of Final Restoration: and that if the believer in the Pre-existence,—adhering strictly and openly to the great principles of Unitarianism, (the Unrivalled Supremacy, Exclusive Worship, and Essential Mercy, of God even the Father,) joining with us in our Unitarian Fellowship Funds, uniting with us exclusively in our Worship, and sitting down with us at the Lord's Supper,—were disposed to associate with us, (without expecting that we should alter our practice in the introduction of books into the Catalogue, or in other means for the dissemination of the Simple Humanity of Christ in connexion with the

Proper Unity of God,) provided we would cease to lay down the avowal of the Simple Humanity as an essential requisite for membership, we ought not to keep him aloof from us.—Firmly and unhesitatingly believing the doctrine of Simple Humanity, advocating it on all occasions where a regard to still more important principles permits me, and satisfied that the current of conviction will eventually lead every Unitarian to the reception of it, I nevertheless believed, that in the *present* state of the Unitarian controversy, the interests of pure Christianity would be more effectually served, by generally relinquishing this as an *exclusive* separating principle; and that even with respect to this doctrine itself, the doubters, or disbelievers, would be more likely to come to us, if they fought with us under common banners. With these views, which as yet I have seen no reason to change, I wished, as the measure had been brought forwards, that it should be subjected to a fair and ample discussion. When I reached Bath the evening before the meeting, I found that some of those who supported the alteration at the preceding meeting would not be present, and I could not learn that any arrangements had been made for bringing the matter regularly forwards. I believe those who wished the change, had done as I had myself, left the matter to its own course. I had myself had no communication with any of them with a view to it.—In these circumstances, I drew up the following resolutions, which, at the wish of Mr. Fawcett, whom alone I conversed with before the service commenced, I undertook to submit to the meeting.

“ That with a view to those believers in the Absolute Unity, Unrivalled Supremacy, Exclusive Worship, and Essential Upurchased Love and Mercy, of God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hold the doctrine of the Simple Pre-existence of our Lord,—and to those who, though they cordially unite in these fundamental principles of Unitarianism, do not possess that decided conviction in the doctrine of the Simple Humanity, which would enable them to avow belief in it,—and also to those believers in the Simple Humanity, who, however important they estimate this doctrine, object to it as an *exclusive* test among persons who are united by the open avowal of doctrines which exclude all who

* I have somewhat recently heard, with great satisfaction, that he has publicly stated that his mind is no longer unsettled, but rests in the simple truth, that the Mediator between God and men was the MAN Christ Jesus.

consistently profess them from the fellowship and even the worship of other denominations of Christians,—that part of the Preamble of this Society which respects its fundamental principles, do stand as follows:

“ That there is but One God, the Maker and Preserver of Heaven and of Earth and of all things therein, Jehovah, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our God and Father;—that Jehovah is One, in substance undivided, in glory unrivalled, supremely great, infinitely powerful, wise, and good, the Only Proper Object of Religious Worship, the Sole Original Source of every blessing both temporal and spiritual;—and that Jesus Christ was the most distinguished of the Messengers of His wisdom and mercy to the human race, authorized and empowered by Him to declare and execute the Gospel-scheme of salvation, or deliverance of mankind from sin and misery; but in every respect, and at every period, now and for ever, subordinate to and dependant upon Him, so that God may be all in all.*

“ That by the proposed alteration in the Preamble, it is not intended to make any change whatever in the *practice* of the Society respecting its chief object, the distribution of books,—agreeably to which, the selection of books is regulated by what are regarded as the sentiments of the great bulk of its Members, while each individual is left to choose for himself what he pleases for his own employment, and is not regarded as responsible for the sentiments advocated or avowed in others.”

At the meeting for business, much time had been occupied, with considering various alterations proposed by the Committee in the Rules; and we came to the main point respecting the Preamble, too late to allow of that species of discussion which I had hoped for. Before the opportunity was afforded me of proposing the above resolutions, &c., the respected individual to whom, I presume, Mr. Belsham alludes, (as having, by his “good sense and solid arguments made a deep impression on all who heard him,”) in the commencement of his address, made a pointed declaration, which I conceive must have made a deeper impression than even his arguments, and which at least prevented the simple effect of these

from being ascertainable,—viz. that if the alteration was made, *several* (I think) of the oldest Members of the Society would withdraw from it. It is my earnest hope, that when any discussion on questions connected with the interests of Christian truth, occur among Unitarians, this mode of biassing a meeting may not be regarded as a precedent. If those Members were resolved to pursue such a measure, in case the disposition of the meeting favoured the alteration, perhaps (in the *present case*) it was desirable that their resolution should be made known before the final decision, but not at the beginning of a discussion.

When my resolutions were read, it seemed doubtful whether they would be seconded: but this was done by a Member from Bristol, with whom I had had no communication on the subject; and this (as far as I can recollect) was the case with respect to all the other Members present, except those in the Committee, at the meetings of which the subject had been brought forwards more than once.

In the course of my remarks to the general meeting, I adverted to the opinion, (which for the reasons already given I believe to be well-founded,) that, if they were otherwise disposed to join us, our Preamble would keep from us two distinguished advocates for Unitarian Christianity; and I conceived that this might be regarded as a specimen of its natural effect: I knew that it had had such an effect in other cases. It was stated in reply, that those individuals had for some time been Members of the *London* Unitarian Society; and this, the Parent Society, lays down, in more explicit yet more scriptural terms, the doctrine of the Simple Humanity as its exclusive basis. The principle on which mainly I advocated the change remained the same; but the practical desirableness of it was greatly lessened.

When as much had been said, on both sides, as the circumstances of the case allowed, understanding that the disposition of the meeting was against the change, and that it would be painful to some of those present to press a division, with the consent of the friend who had seconded my proposed reso-

* I perceive it would be easy to improve this declaration, but I have not felt myself at liberty to make any alteration in it.

lutions, *I withdrew them*. As far as the present prosperity of the Society is concerned, and the satisfaction of some of its most effective Members, I see no cause to regret the failure of the proposal.

And now I must offer a few remarks on some parts of Mr. Belsham's communication. I will take them as they occur. The letter itself has, without a doubt, been perused by all your readers, with the attention which every thing which comes from his pen receives among us; and I need not therefore quote at large.

(1) As far as I am concerned, (and I presume it was the case with others,) the question was not brought forwards "inadvertently," nor "under a mistaken notion of liberality." Had I been a Member of the W. U. S. at its commencement, I should have been one of those who conceived (as I still think) that the line of distinction was then necessary.—My opinion now is, that those who are excluded, by certain principles, from the worship and communion of every other Christian Church, and are united in worship and communion on those principles, and are alike strict in maintaining them, and alike *desirous of openly avowing and promoting them*, should make *those* principles the bond of union. And my conviction is, that by such a system, not only the great principles of Unitarianism would be most effectually promoted, but even those which most Unitarians decidedly believe to be scriptural truth respecting the person of Christ. It is not in my mind (I may venture to assert) the result of "latitudinarian principles," or concern for the *personal feelings* of those whom we exclude: however much I may be affected by these, I am not influenced by them: if I were, there are others to *outweigh* them on the other side.—As to *inadvertency*, after what I have said, let the reader judge. I know that in pursuing the course I did, I went on merely because I could not otherwise satisfy my own mind. Few could be aware of the painful feelings with which the previous discussions had been attended: and my own *wishes* were, that the subjects should have been dropped with the Annual Meeting. I knew nothing of the Report which a highly-valued friend sent you

of the proceedings; or I would have requested him simply to state, that the opinion of the Meeting was against the proposed alteration.

(2) Though *principle* should never be sacrificed, yet what is *unnecessarily offensive* to others should be avoided. The term *idolatrous* in the Preamble of the L. U. S., which was also adopted in that of the W. U. S., is to me extremely objectionable: if taken in the common acceptation it conveys a wrong idea; if not, it is at least useless. And it is my conviction, that such expressions have kept many more from Unitarianism, than they can possibly have brought to us. They needlessly arouse prejudice, more than they awaken inquiry.—Undoubtedly the noble band who "so strenuously insisted upon" "the retaining of this offensive expression" pursued that course which they thought principle required; and far be it from me to throw suspicion on their motives: but that it lost us the *public* (though I apprehend inconsistent) *avowal* of Unitarian sentiments and *co-operation* in the dissemination of them, by Jones, and Tyrwhitt, and "the whole body of Unitarians then existing in the University of Cambridge," must have operated greatly to produce the present blank with respect to Unitarian prospects in that University; and taken more generally, must have impeded the spread of our principles much more than the retaining of this offensive expression can have done good.

(3) In my judgment it is not a "trifling logomachy" in what way the term *Unitarian* shall be employed. Multitudes now glory in the name, with all its reproachful associations, and are getting nearer and nearer to us, the believers in the Simple Humanity, who, had it continued to be restricted to *ourselves*, would still have been at least on neutral ground, and unable to join with us (as they now do heart and hand) in the great and ennobling efforts which are making to disseminate our grand principles, and to participate in our cheering and encouraging prospects of their final triumph.

(4) The object of many of the books in the W. U. S. Catalogue, is, to promote the great principles of Unitarianism without entering into minor

distinctions, (such, for instance, as Mr. Gifford's *Elucidation*,) and those important practical consequences respecting the character and dealings of God which are affected but little by the doctrine of Simple Humanity. From these, a believer in the Pre-existence joining our Society, might make an ample selection for his own distribution.—Besides, many who held that doctrine, cheerfully distributed books in which the doctrine of the Simple Humanity is advocated, if they thought them suited effectually to promote the grand principles of Unitarianism: in like manner as many distribute the Improved Version who believe in the Miraculous Conception, and do not accord with some of the notes in other parts; and as many Unitarians distribute books of practical piety, even if here and there occur an expression in which they cannot unite; and as still more distribute Bibles and Testaments in the Authorized Version, though they are convinced that Solomon's Song is not a religious book and has no pretensions to divine authority, that the passage respecting the Three Heavenly Witnesses is a gross interpolation, and that in several other parts it does not exhibit the best representation even of the Received Text, and that this, in several places, departs from the *original text*.*

(5) If I understand the character of that upright, conscientious, and able individual, to whom the W. U. S. was mainly indebted for its existence, and who contributed so effectually and extensively to the prosperity of the Unitarian cause, especially in the West of England,—he would not have considered the adoption of the proposed change, as “conveying an oblique and unkind reflection on his memory.” Mr. Kenrick valued too much, and understood too well, the right of private judgment. But if otherwise, there is, for every individual, a straight line which must not be warped to personal feelings: and when such motives, appealing to some

of our best affections, are brought forwards to deter or lead away from the steady consistent adherence to it, the interests of duty, if not of truth, must suffer in proportion as they are effectual.

(6) It is reasonable to suppose that Mr. Belsham must be more acquainted than I can be, with the constitution of the different Unitarian Societies in this kingdom; but I have never heard of an instance in which the once adopted Preamble of any Society has been altered, in order to make it more comprehensive. Several have been formed upon the more comprehensive basis; and my opinion is, that as long as there is the *London Unitarian Society* as a central point of union for the believers in the Simple Humanity, (and long, with the exception of the word *idolatrous*, may it continue as it is, and go on and prosper,) by uniting with which, they may, in the most public manner such Associations enable them to do, declare their convictions in this important doctrine,—the various other Societies now bearing the name of Unitarian, would do well to connect with the fundamental principles of Unitarianism, nothing which should keep those from us, who in *spirit, zeal, and co-operation*, would willingly prove that they are not against us.

(7) Who, among the Ministers who for the last twelve years have preached before the W. U. S. at our annual meetings, have advocated the Simple Humanity, more plainly and decidedly than those who desired the proposed change? And though several of our best sermons of late have not particularly entered upon that doctrine, yet they have boldly and unequivocally opposed popular errors, and shewn that Unitarianism is, in truth, “the doctrine according to godliness!” If the proposed alteration in the Preamble had been made, (and even any unexpected change taken place in the practice of the Society,) the sermons of Mr. Fox, and Mr. John Kenrick, and even that of Mr. Kentish, for instance, might, with equal propriety have been delivered at our annual meetings. And for myself I plainly declare, that had I afterwards been to preach before the Society, while

* It must have been upon the same general principle, that the *London Unitarian Society*, some years ago, introduced *Archdeacon Blackburne's Works* into their Catalogue.

I laid the greatest stress on the doctrines which I hold most important, and in which all Unitarians are agreed, I should, without hesitation, have endeavoured to lead those who still differ from us, a little farther. Nor do I believe, from all I have observed of the dispositions and views of such persons, that if I preached with the simplicity of truth and in the tone of Christian charity, they would have at all objected to it. At any rate they could not reasonably calculate on our silence.*

(8) I have only farther to observe, that Mr. Belsham seems to me to consider the proposed alteration in the Preamble of the *Western* Unitarian Society, as affecting that of the *London*. They are perfectly distinct; have no controul over each other's concerns; and nothing farther to do with each other, than as united in the same great objects, having several Members in common, and sometimes co-operating in effecting the publication of works for distribution, and the London Society supplying the Western with books, much in the same manner as the London book-seller supplies his correspondent in the country. And I imagine there is the same kind of connexion, and no more, between the London Society and the various other Societies in different districts, for the promotion of Unitarian principles by the distribution of books.

I have now finished all I have to lay before your readers on this subject. If any of my valued friends, (differing from me on this point, while we unite with cordiality and full consent in so many others, and having the great interests of Christian truth alike at heart, though not always agreeing in the means of promoting them,) should think it necessary to make any strictures on what I have said, I pledge myself, as I have done on another subject, plainly to express

any change of opinion they may produce, or to acknowledge any error into which I may inadvertently have fallen.—If I maintain the silence I wish, I entreat that it may be considered as no mark of disrespect to them; but simply as an indication, that my sentiments remain unchanged, and that I perceive no advantage in prolonging the discussion.

LANT CARPENTER.

P. S. An illness which suspended all my usual occupations, has prevented my publishing my *Reply to Bishop Magee*, as I expected, about this time; but I hope to advertise it as being published in the same Number in which this Letter will, I trust, be sufficiently early to appear.—In the last paragraph of p. 618, on Divine Influences, I noticed *duly* for *only*, which I beg the reader to correct.

SIR, December 14, 1819.

IN a former Number of your Repository (p. 623) appeared a communication signed W. W., animadverting upon a recent controversy between two anatomical professors. As no person immediately interested in the reputation of the parties has come forward to notice his remarks, you will, I trust, admit a few observations from one who lays claim to no other character in connexion with this business than that of a spectator, known indeed to both the professors, but not the eulogist or the apologist of either. What induces me to trouble you, is the strange inaccuracy of the statements made by your Correspondent. From the freedom and severity of his censures, and the tone of authority, *quasi ex cathedrâ*, with which he pronounces his condemnation, a stranger would naturally infer that he was fully master of all the facts of the case; and that, after his verdict, your readers, simple and wise, had nothing to do but to sit down in the belief, that the two professors had "disgraced" themselves, by the "way not very honourable to them," in which they had conducted and "terminated" their "dispute." But your readers will, I doubt not, be surprised to learn, 1. That there was, "during the last winter," no "controversy

* I have just observed that Mr. Fox's *Voice of Revelation*, delivered before the London Unitarian Society, and containing statements in favour of the Simple Humanity, was afterwards delivered before the Eastern Unitarian Society, founded, if I mistake not, on the broad basis.

afloat amongst the medical professors and students at St. Bartholomew Hospital," on the subject to which W. W. advertises, further than that subject might have formed a topic of conversation there, as it did at all the other hospitals:—2. That no lectures were delivered at that Hospital on the "Origin of the Vital Principle," and, consequently, that "the pupils of each lecturer" did not "enlist under the banners of their master" with any "acrimonious" or hostile spirit:—3. That Mr. Lawrence is not now, and never has been, a "lecturer" at Bartholomew Hospital, and, consequently, delivered no "Physiological Lectures" there, which your readers may consult:—4. That neither did Mr. Abernethy deliver any Physiological Lectures there, which are printed and open to public inspection: And 5, that the "governors of the charitable institution, to which both gentlemen are surgeons," did not, for any cause whatever, "suspend Mr. Lawrence from two of his appointments."

The plain history of the case which W. W. has so unaccountably mistaken and misrepresented, is briefly this: In the year 1814, Mr. Abernethy was appointed Professor of Anatomy and Surgery to the College of Surgeons, in Lincoln's Inn Fields. In the Lectures which, under this appointment, he delivered *at the College*, in that and the following years, he took occasion to state and vindicate "Mr. Hunter's opinions respecting life and diseases." The two Introductory Lectures of the first course, and a part of the Introductory Lecture of the second, he afterwards published. In 1816, Mr. Lawrence, who is one of the assistant surgeons of Bartholomew Hospital, was chosen to succeed Mr. Astley Cooper as the other Professor of Anatomy and Surgery to the College, and that year followed his predecessor in delivering a course of Lectures on Comparative Anatomy. In these lectures Mr. Lawrence controverted and ridiculed the Hunterian theory of life, which his brother lecturer had been advocating.

In the year following, Mr. Abernethy delivered a course of "Physiological Lectures, exhibiting a general view of Mr. Hunter's Physiology," &c., in which he supported the opinions he had before maintained, and expressed his disapprobation of the systems of the French Physiologists. These are the Lectures, I presume, to which your Correspondent means to refer your readers. Mr. Lawrence, the next year, (1818,) delivered another course, in which he again took up the subject, and stood forward as the champion of the French school. These are the lectures which gave so much public offence, and which he suppressed after their publication. Of these lectures the only public notice, as far as I know, taken by Mr. Abernethy, is contained in a temperate Postscript to his "Hunterian Oration," which was delivered in February last, and published shortly after.

In order to form a correct judgment of the merits of the controversy, it is necessary to peruse the whole of these publications, and to them I beg to refer your Correspondent himself. If after the perusal of them he should still think that the professors have "disgraced" themselves by the management and termination of it, he must be left to the enjoyment of his opinion.

One word on another part of his communication. Mr. Lawrence held the appointment of surgeon to Bridewell, and also to a certain institution for healing the maladies of the mind, lately removed from Moorfields to the neighbourhood of St. George's Fields. It is true, that the governors of the latter did take alarm at his metaphysical heresy, and, as if infected by the atmosphere they breathed, proceeded to suspend him from his office, judging, no doubt, that orthodoxy of opinion was essential to practical skill in the cure of the disorders immediately under their charge. To their judgment Mr. Lawrence sacrificed his book, and made his peace by its suppression.

* * * *

REVIEW.

" Still pleased to praise, yet not afraid to blame."—POPE.

ART. I.—A Course of Lectures on Subjects connected with the Corruption, Revival, and Future Influence of Genuine Christianity. By W. J. Fox. 8vo. pp. 324. [A Second Edition in 12mo. pp. 386.] Hunter and Eaton. 1819.

THESE Lectures were heard, we are informed, with marked attention by a crowded auditory, at whose unanimous request they have been published. The author defines controversial sermons (Pref. p. v.), "speeches to set people thinking," and judging of these before us by this rule, we must pronounce that the Lecturer has completely succeeded; for whether the reader agree in opinion with the Lecturer or differ from him, it seems to us impossible that his mind should not be excited by the specimens of dense thought, forcible argumentation, brilliant eloquence, and, we had almost said, sparkling wit, that are here displayed: and the effect must have been much more powerful upon the hearer of the Lectures.

To such as look in a sermon for the qualities of an essay or a dissertation, Mr. Fox's Lectures will appear too declamatory, and to such as think that the prejudices of the many ought to be conciliated and not alarmed, his tone will sometimes appear too decided, bold and startling; but the coldest critic must allow that the declamation (if such it be) is splendid, and the most timid theologian must acknowledge, if not admire, the honesty, manliness and Christian frankness which characterize every page.

The few extracts that the scope of our work permits us to make will testify the Lecturer's extent of knowledge, his facility of turning his great reading to account, his power of intellect, his clearness of judgment, and, above all, his richness of imagination; they may, perhaps, shew also hastiness of composition, abruptness of manner, familiarity, even to homeliness, of style, and, in some instances, the extension and accumulation of metaphors beyond the limits of good taste.

Lect. I. is "On Antichrist." In his description of this allegorical personage Mr. Fox agrees with Mr. Evanson, ["Letter to Hurd,"] considering the character typical not of any one particular church, but of all churches in which are found the following marks of apostacy: "dominion over conscience, alliance with the temporal authority, mystery, idolatrous worship, blasphemy, hypocrisy, deceit and affected austerity, and persecution." (P. 10.) He applies to Antichrist, thus expounded, the prophecies of Daniel, &c., which are usually interpreted by Protestants of the great Christian apostacy. We question, however, whether sufficient attention has yet been paid to the arguments of Grotius, who maintains that all the predictions in question related to persons and powers out of the Church. His reasoning is, we confess, to our minds unanswerable. (See his *Commentatio et Appendix de Antichristo*, Op. IV. 457, &c.)

Referring to "pious frauds," Mr. Fox says,

" While we gladly forget the gross trickeries by which, in dark ages, ignorance was gulled that it might be enslaved and plundered, we must be allowed to express regret that Protestants and Dissenters should yet retain some traces of this evil. How often, in the recollection of every one, has reputed heresy been assailed with calumnious and forged tales of blasphemies and sudden judgments, got up for the purpose of terrifying men from the use of their common sense on religious subjects! Truth despairs such arms: they are the weapons of Antichrist, and worthy only of the policy of the Inquisition, which, when its victims are led to the stake, clothes them with robes covered with painted devils. Happily, their use is almost abandoned by the more respectable of every party."—Pp. 19, 20.

The following reflections come in seasonably after the Lecturer's denunciation of prevailing corruption and apostacy:

" This view of our subject, though at first it may seem harsh, is really conducive to charity. It teaches that no one body of professing Christians is to be singled out,

and held up for odium, as peculiarly stained with the characteristics of the predicted apostacy; but that they are scattered, though in different proportions, over the whole of nominal Christendom. We turn from mutual accusation to inquiry after the portion of the evil which we may have shared, and endeavour to correct it. What Presbyterian does not blush at the stern hatred of his forefathers to Rome, as the only Antichrist? What Churchman should not be ashamed of such a paltry excuse for depriving his Catholic fellow-subject of civil rights? Our attention is drawn from men to systems; to religious tyranny, mystery, idolatry, fraud, persecution; they alone are held up to hatred, opposition, condemnation, and destruction.—May they perish, and for ever!"—P. 23.

The 11th Lect. is "On Church-of-Englandism," a compound term, more expressive than elegant, borrowed from Mr. Jeremy Bentham. The text at the head of this Lecture announces the preacher's design; Acts xix. 15: *Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?* By an induction of particulars, the characteristics of Antichrist, above enumerated, are here pointed out as adhering to the Church of England. Of its constitution, the Lecturer says, in figurative language,

"It is a massy and imposing edifice, not modelled, indeed, with Grecian simplicity, but shooting up, like its own Gothic buildings, into towers and pinnacles of various dignity, all of aspiring form—though while their heads are in the clouds, their foundations press heavily upon the earth, and their shade throws gloom and chilliness around on monuments of death; and all is overtopped by the lofty spire of archiepiscopal eminence; where sometimes, to finish the resemblance, has been seen only a vane, veering to every breeze of political direction."—P. 44.

With great candour, Mr. Fox pronounces (p. 47) a warm eulogium on the Liturgy of our National Church. He allows, however, that much of it may have descended from a very early age of Christianity. He might, we think, have spoken more strongly. The real praise is due to the Roman Missal. "Those who first compiled, or since revised, the English Book of Common-Prayer," says Dr. Geddes,*

did little more than translate from the Latin Original. Let me add, that, wherever they abandon this Original, there is, if I mistake not, a want of dignity in their composition, that immediately betrays the innovation."

The conclusion of this Lecture is a description of the majesty of England, and an apostrophe to her, and is, perhaps, the finest specimen that can be extracted of the peculiarities of Mr. Fox's eloquence:

"To conclude: designing men, even in the present day, have dared to represent dissent from the Church as synonymous with disaffection to the State. It is a foul calumny. The sternest and sturdiest protest against the one, may coexist with the most enthusiastic devotion to the other. England was great and glorious while her religion was Popery. She then reared her head above the nations, outstripped them all in the career of improvement, and soared above them towards the heaven of liberty. The great charter of her freedom was then wrested from unwilling power: commerce and manufactures were raising her citizens, burgesses and merchants, to wealth and intelligence, and placing them side by side with her barons; while, from contending elements, arose the harmony of representative government. She was great while that change, called Reformation, was proceeding, or retarded, or subsiding into fixedness, through successive reigns. She then began to wave her flag of sovereignty over the sea; her laws were framed in wisdom; and her literature, splendid in genius, profound in learning, and mighty in originality, advanced with giant step. She was great at that tremendous period when the crown was trampled in the dust, a regal head fell on the scaffold, and Cromwell sat on an ungarnished throne. Episcopacy was not her religion then. The Church of England fled to the wilderness: the mitre was crushed under sectarian feet, and the crozier snapped asunder by unconsecrated hands: yet then she was great; not a nation but cringed for her friendship, and trembled at her frown. Was there persecution, oppression or insult, on the Continent,—she lifted her voice of thunder, and Europe's hills were moved; her mountains quaked and trembled to their foundations. And while Episcopacy has been Church-of-England-

* Medest Apology for Roman Catholics, p. 169. "For the matter contained in that book," says Milton, "we need no

better witness than King Edward the Sixth, who to the Cornish rebels confesses it was no other than the old mass-book done into English, all but some few words that were expunged."

ism, our country has been great and glorious still ;—yes, through vicissitude, great ; in adversity and disappointment, in privation and suffering, in all changes and chances, in arms and arts, in literature and benevolence. The monuments of her majesty reflect the glittering of every star of heaven ; and not a wind can blow that has not wasted from her shores some freight of charity. And she would be great, were this assuming sect lost in oblivion, with all its robes, and forms, and wealth, and creeds : still to her would the nations look, as to an elder sister of the earth, pre-eminent in wisdom, grace and majesty.

“ Yes ; England, independently of adventitious circumstances, or predominant sects, must be admired and loved by all who can rightly think and feel ; nor would the hand that might not object to pull down the clustering ivy from the oak, whose strength it wasted, and impaired its beauty, touch profanely one leaf of the hallowed tree. O my country ! land of my birth, my love, and my pride ; land of freedom and of glory ; land of bards and heroes, of statesmen, philosophers and patriots ; land of Alfred and of Sydney, of Hampden and Russel, of Newton, Locke and Milton ; may thy security, liberty, generosity, peace and pre-eminence, be eternal ! May thy children prize their birthright, and well guard and extend their privileges ! From the annals of thy renown, the deeds of thy worthies, the precious volumes of thy sages, may they imbibe the love of freedom, of virtue, of their country ! May the pure gospel be their portion ! Through every future age, may they arise, as of yore, the protectors of the oppressed, the terror of tyrants, the guardians of the rights and peace of nations, the champions of civil and religious liberty ; and may they be the possessors and diffusers of genuine Christianity to all countries, through all generations ! Amen ! ”—Pp. 49—51.

The subjects of Lect. III. are “ Religious Liberty and Nonconformity ;” “ an appropriate transition from the mischiefs and miseries of the Anti-christian apostacy, to the gospel in its native simplicity, power and blessedness.”—P. 52.

A just distinction is made of the liberty of Christian Churches into external and internal, that which they claim of the civil power, and that which they allow to their own members. The latter, it is truly said, (p. 53,) even by sincere and eloquent advocates of the former, has been too often misunderstood, overlooked or violated.

The history of religious tyranny is traced, pp. 59—62, with the hand of a master.

In the following passage, the abstract argument for dissent is admirably stated :

“ We dissent because human legislators exceed their province when they pretend to fix the religion of the country. Society cannot exist without government. It is for the good of the whole that we should have laws, and that their administration and execution should not be left to individual zeal, but be the peculiar duty of persons appointed to that office. This requires the surrender of much natural right, of how much, human wisdom must decide : it may fairly include even life itself, which, when the good of the community requires, should be offered a willing and a patriotic sacrifice : but the rights of conscience are, from their very nature, inalienable. Man never did give them ; he never can give them. The right of believing where he sees evidence of truth, and of worshipping where he finds characteristics of divinity, as it cannot injure society, cannot belong to society. It is inherent in man, as a rational creature, and he cannot divest himself of it, till he can re-create himself, and become another being, and his own God. What, then, does a legislator mean, when he says, You shall believe this doctrine ; you shall worship that God ; you are born to this religion ; we decree that you shall be a Deist or a Christian, a Mahometan or a Pagan, a Catholic or a Protestant, and will punish your disobedience. And who gave you this right ? God ? Produce the commission, and work the confirming miracle. Man ? When and where ? None could do it for themselves, much less for others. But you have the power—true ; so had Herod, (who was devoured of worms,) when he slew James ; so had Nero, (who was assassinated,) when he martyred Paul ; so had Pilate, (who died in miserable exile,) when he sentenced Christ ; and so had others who died in splendour, but who wait in their graves the righteous judgment of God. You have the power—to do what ? To issue the decree ? And so you have to decree that robbery is religion, and persecution for the glory of God : so you have to decree that the sun shall shine by night, and the moon by day, and they will as soon obey your bidding as the mind and heart of man. But you can inflict the penalties : yes, and make martyrs of the firm, and hypocrites of the fearful—nothing more. No human authority has either the right or power to make any system the religion of any individual. We reverence human laws and governors up to this point ; but with our consciences,

our worship, and our God, they have no business. We cannot belong to the Church of England, because, however mildly exercised, she recognizes this claim of man to tell with authority his fellow-man what he shall believe, and whom and how he shall adore. Her Articles and Liturgy have been rightly described, by one of her own prelates, 'as a long act of parliament; a decree of the senate deciding what we are to think of God, how we are to feel and speak in his presence, and by what to obtain his blessing! Did they appear to us absolutely true, and supremely excellent, we have never delegated, nor can we ever acknowledge, the authority of others to decide for us that they were so, and compel us to their belief and use.' Pp. 64—66.

This is the unanswerable argument for Nonconformity with regard to political or national Churches. Of some of the more palpable reasons for dissent, the author says, perhaps with too much smartness,

"I have not patience to rake together the pettifogging absurdities, contradictions and superstitions about crosses, and rings, and kneeling, and bowing, and altars, and Easter, and such like things, which in rich abundance disfigure the practices of the Church, and to one educated a Dissenter make it a matter of some toil and study to drill himself, so as to execute, correctly, the manœuvres and evolutions of divine worship. If men think they can please God by getting up such exhibitions, let them try; but not impose them on others for Christianity."—P. 71.

Mr. Fox thus answers one of the popular arguments for a national establishment of religion:

"But religious instruction for the bulk of the people should be provided. Let it by all means. Who instruct them now? Whose schools exclude half the population of the country—those of the Sectaries or of the Establishment? Who raise the character of the poor by discourses which they can understand and feel? What sort of instructors will they generally be, who owe their office, not to the people, but to patronage? What is the fact? Where dissent is tolerated, is not more knowledge diffused by voluntary exertion than by established institutions? We may read, in broad characters, the importance of liberty to religious light, in those countries where the genuine spirit and tendency of slavery is unmitigated by the corrective of even tolerated dissent. How deplorable is their condition! There the populace are uniformly sunk in the most abject

ignorance and superstition. There priests and people, blind leaders of the blind, sink together into the very barbarism of ignorance. There is the grave of intellect and of knowledge, of morals and of freedom." —Pp. 79, 80.

The Lecture concludes (pp. 85—87) with a truly Christian plea for charity, towards such as may hold an intolerant system.

Lect. IV. is "On Unitarianism." In the introduction, the "immense importance" of the doctrine of the Divine Unity is illustrated by an assemblage of metaphors, which reminds us of the style of an age long gone by.

"It is the soul of Judaism, the foundation of Christianity, the noblest discovery of reason, the glory of revelation, the centre of religious truth, the antidote of infidelity, the death blow of idolatry, the spring of Reformation, the guiding star of free inquiry, the companion of liberty, the parent of piety, the source of light in the mind and goodness in the heart, and the inheritor of supreme dominion over faith, to which it is directed by prophecy, and will be conducted by Providence, in all nations."—P. 88.

Mr. Fox very judiciously separates the private opinions of Unitarians from Unitarianism.

"The discussion of Unitarianism has been much embarrassed, and its cause injured, by its being mixed up with the private opinions of its friends. There is gross mistake, or wilful injustice, in reckoning whatever is held by certain Unitarians essential to Unitarianism itself. The humanity of Christ is not essential to Unitarianism. Although differing from most respectable authority, I have no hesitation in deeming such limitation most improper. It is inconsistent with the etymology and meaning of the term, and its historical use. Dr. Price was an Unitarian as well as Dr. Priestley; so is every worshipper of the Father only, whether he believe that Christ was created before all worlds, or first existed when born of Mary. Philosophical Necessity is no part of Unitarianism: to some Unitarians it seems the plain dictate of reason and Scripture, illustrative of the character of God and plans of Providence, a glory around the cross of faith, and a rock for the anchor of hope; but others think it inconsistent with the threatenings and promises of God, and the responsibility of man; and a similar diversity obtains among the speculative of other denominations. Materialism is no part of Unitarianism. Some of us believe that man is formed of one substance, others

of two: some that unconsciousness prevails from death to the resurrection; and others that the transition is immediate to bliss and glory, or to punishment, of the separated spirit. The denial of angels or devils is no part of Unitarianism: some believe in one, or the other, or in both."—Pp. 91, 92.

He then describes the doctrines in which Unitarians agree, amongst which is incorrectly placed that of "the ultimate restoration of all things," it being well known that many Unitarians believe in the final destruction of the impenitent.

There is great weight of argument in that part of the Lecture which considers Judaism as Unitarianism, and represents this principle of Judaism as adopted by Christianity; as also in that which treats of "certain general characteristics of Christianity given in Scripture, to which Unitarianism and Trinitarianism may be brought as tests." With equal ingenuity and judgment, the author points out "indications of danger and apostasy, noticed by the apostles in the primitive Church." He exposes himself, perhaps, to misrepresentation in his description of "different classes of Unitarians who are out of the pale of Christianity;" though the agreement of so many wise and good men in the doctrine of the Unity of God, surely proves, as he says, (p. 119,) either that it is "the plain dictate of right reason, preached by the heavens and the earth, where man will hear their voice; or that it is a fragment of some original revelation, passed down by tradition to all ages and countries, and selected by the wise and good from the mass of accompanying absurdity."

In Lecture V. Mr. Fox descants "On Creeds, Controversy, and the Influence of Religious Systems on Society," topics of large and undefined extent. They are treated in nearly the reverse order in which they are given in this title.

The remarks on the influence of religion and the effects of the different systems of it are peculiarly striking. As an instance of the boasted perfection of Creeds, it is observed, (p. 443,) that "in a collection of sixteen creeds of Protestant Churches, published at Geneva, 1612, there are only six (of which that of the Church of England

is not one) that speak of the providence of God, and *eleven take no notice of the resurrection of the dead.*" Amongst other proofs of the utility of controversy, Mr. Fox appeals to the *retreat* of the assumed orthodox from their own proper system.

"Had the Church of England and the Calvinistic Dissenters to frame their creeds, without precedent to guide them, the Thirty-nine Articles would not originate with the one, nor the Assembly's Confession with the other. The standard of orthodoxy is lower than it was; and it continues to sink: but if the party be right now, they have been wrong; if now they are strictly scriptural, they have been unscriptural, and they have to thank their opponents for driving or shaming them back into the right road. While individuals (in no small number) have completely renounced the system, the whole mass has slowly receded; the tide yet ebbs and flows at intervals; but the old mark is not reached at its height, and at its influx the old bank is left unwashed by the billows; for generations yet the fluctuations may continue, but all will finally settle at the point of truth."—Pp. 150, 151.

Mr. Fox discusses in Lect. VI. the interesting but difficult question of "War." His object is to shew that "War is a great, *but not insuperable*, obstacle to that general improvement in the state of man which Christianity tends and was designed to realize." And he represents war as "opposed to the well-being and progress of society by the misery it inflicts, the criminality it implies and the mischiefs it produces."

There is truth as well as imagination in the following description:

"It is the tendency of war to produce war, and thus to extend and multiply miseries. Treaties of peace seem little better than links to connect one war with another. They leave something ambiguous for future dissension, some germ of discord, which grows into a poison tree. Indeed, the professed object of hostility is seldom determined in favour of either party, by the peace. In the series of wars which have for ages desolated Europe, we may generally see one growing out of another. The various connexions and interests of nations serve to spread hostility when once commenced. This was particularly exemplified in the late contest, into which nation after nation was drawn or forced. The torrent of blood swelled, as it rolled on; still fresh sluices opened, till it spread and widened, and

seemed without fathom or bound. Like the Glacier, from the mountain's top, it rushed on, accumulating as it fell, and finding in one work of ruin materials to render the next more wide and dreadful. It stretched from the old world to the new, wrapping both continents in its flames, and covering the earth as with a fiery deluge of desolation."—Pp. 170, 171.

The Lecturer admits the right of resistance to aggression or tyranny, but this, he contends, is not war. "Defensive war is a solicitude.—A license to attack is essential to war." Pp. 208, 209.

To encourage the hope of the ultimate abolition of war, the author says, "Two facts are cheering. 1. Peace now scarcely differs more from war, than modern warfare does from ancient.—2. The tendencies of society have been, and are, to limit war, and consequently to abolish it ultimately." Pp. 181 and 183.

The more common pretexts of war are examined, (pp. 184—187,) and as they come under review, they make us blush for human nature.

In conclusion, Christianity is represented as incompatible with war, and its universal diffusion and influence, guaranteed by prophecy, is argued upon as tantamount to the abolition of the nefarious practice.

An Appendix to this Lecture is devoted to the examination of Paley's Chapter on War in his Moral Philosophy, and here the author displays great acuteness. He is somewhat *heretical* on the subject of the "Jewish wars." "Their example," he says, (p. 199,) "justifies massacre, or it does not justify war." He adds, "The power that should attempt to repeat the frightful scenes of the conquest of Canaan, would soon be blotted out of the map of the world, by an universal combination of civilized states." True, but it may be asserted with equal justice, that the nation that should now practise the atrocities of which the Canaanites were guilty, would be justly treated as the enemy of all mankind. Their human sacrifices, not to mention other crimes, were more abominable than the slave-trade, against which there is now a confederacy of all Christian states. On this ground we rest, and we think safely, the defence of their destruction. In the final sentence of his paragraph

on this subject, the author dismisses the "objector" rather *cavalierly*: "If it be said that the Deity would not command what was morally wrong, the objector is referred to the command for Abraham to sacrifice his son; and if this does not satisfy him, he may, if he so please, consult Dr. Geddes." Let him consult Dr. Geddes, who treats the injunction to destroy the Canaanites as a patriotic fraud; but let him consult, on the other side, for the justification of his objection, Mr. Good's remarks upon this notion in his valuable Memoirs of the learned translator (8vo. 1809, pp. 368—473); the late Bishop of Landaff's Apology for the Bible, in reply to the "Age of Reason;" and Jameson's Dissertation, in an Appendix to his Exposition of the Pentateuch, Folio, pp. 775—779, which was esteemed satisfactory by the late Mr. Lindsey, and was, we believe at his instance, reprinted as one of the tracts of the Unitarian Society.

This Lecture has of necessity a political complexion; but though the author exercises in it his wonted mental courage, he has not laid himself open to *any other animadversion than that of the critic*. We write this after Lord Castlereagh's new Bills have been proposed to Parliament.

Mr. Fox praises an historical character, not often the subject of eulogy:

"What a fine contrast to Yorkists, Lancastrians, Stuarts, Bourbons, and all the rest who 'wade through slaughter to a throne,' was Richard Cromwell! He was advised to take off a seditious leader, and secure his father's elevation for himself. 'No,' said he, 'I will not purchase authority at the price of one man's blood.'"—P. 185.

The VIIIth and last Lecture is "On Human Perfectibility." All that the author means by this is "a state of very high improvement, of knowledge, liberty, peace, virtue and felicity, to which man will be, in the latter days, conducted by Christianity." And the expectation of this is undoubtedly justified by reason and Scripture. Mr. Fox separates from his theory the notion of "organic perfectibility, the triumph of mind over matter," which was entertained by the system-builders, who, a few years ago, maintained "Human Perfectibility;" but we

question whether he allows sufficient weight to the influence of *disease* and *death* in keeping down man, as an individual, to the level on which he has hitherto stood. Still, who would check those hopes of a better age, which tend to realize themselves, and to advance, at the same time, the virtue and the happiness of mankind? Cold must his heart be who cannot, in some of the better moments of existence, give himself up to the influence of the Lecturer's glowing anticipations of "millenial glories."

As a whole, we think this Lecture inferior to the preceding; but its defects are more than compensated in the *Notes*, in which the author briefly discusses the theory of *Malthus* with a degree of ability that leads us to wish that he would take up that subject in a separate publication, and give a popular refutation of the new hypothesis; in so far, at least, as it may be thought to present an obstacle to the best Christian hopes, and to countenance war and the degradation and oppression of the mass of the human race.

This volume has, we learn, and as we should have expected, excited public attention, in an extraordinary degree, to the Course of Lectures which Mr. Fox is now delivering; and every friend to Christian truth must rejoice in knowing that multitudes are receiving assistance in their religious inquiries from so able and enlightened a champion of "the faith once delivered to the saints."

ART. II.—*A new Version of some of the Epistles of St. Paul, &c.*

(Concluded from p. 699.)

IT remains that we speak more particularly concerning the merits of this volume.

Philalethes is much to be commended for making an accurate text the basis of his version. We have already perceived that, with a few trifling variations, he follows the readings of the best critical edition of the Christian Scriptures. The principal instances of his departure from it, besides those we have previously enumerated, are Coloss. ii. 13, iii. 12, 15, iv. 13; 1 Thess. ii. 15, iii. 2, iv. 13; 2 Thess. i. 10, ii. 2; 1 Tim. i. 4, vi. 4; 2 Tim. ii. 19, iv. 1; James

ii. 13, 24, iii. 12,* iv. 2, 13, v. 9. In a single case we have found him substituting conjecture for a reading supported by unimpeachable authority.† Yet he modestly speaks of himself as having *adopted* the alleged emendation. We may refer to Wetstein, (in loc.,) whose inner margin presents this note, “*δ κατεχων* το κατεχον. P. Junius, R. Valesius.” It should be added that the Syr. Transl. has the neuter participle.

Of the claims of *Philalethes* to the merit of faithfulness and perspicuity, our readers will in some measure judge from the extracts laid before them: these have purposely been numerous; and if there be any individual who, on such a subject, condemns the desire of attaining the nicest accuracy, let him know that his censure is egregiously misplaced. To possess as exact a version as possible of the records of the revealed will of Almighty God, must be an object of vast importance: the translator of these writings then should be as scrupulously attentive to every part of his undertaking as though he were weighing grains of precious metals for the young and inexperienced. Although the doctrines of the gospel do not depend on the refinements of verbal criticism, yet the evidences, the character, and, in many cases, the sense, of the books of Scripture, cannot without this criticism be justly ascertained. Let no man conceive that his mind is comprehensive and profound only because it is incorrect. He who suffers himself to be ignorant of minute circumstances and particular facts, will never be master of general principles: his pretensions are refuted both by the reason of the thing and the history of literature and science. Superficial and conceited, he in vain aspires to the character of a philosopher and scholar. There is an admirable remark of Dr. S. Clarke's,‡ which cannot be too deeply inscribed on every student's memory: “*Levia quidem haec, et parvi fortè, si per se spectentur, momenti. Sed ex elementis constant, ex principiis oriuntur, omnia: Et ex judicii consue-*

* The beginning of this verse is not translated interrogatively by *Philalethes*.

† 2 Thess. ii. 7.

‡ *Præfat. ad Homer. Iliad.*

tudine in rebus *minutis* adhibitā, pendet sēpissimē etiam in *maximis* vera atque accurata Scientia." Never, perhaps, was any observation more completely or more beautifully illustrated in its author; this great man being equally distinguished by enlarged views and indefatigable researches, by various and extensive learning and by a sound, acute, discriminating judgment—in a word, by superior correctness and superior vigour of understanding.

From the maxims that we have quoted, *Philalethes* will not withhold his approbation. We believe him to be "a scholar, and a ripe and good one;" and therefore he is a friend to precision and accuracy in biblical criticism. As his performance bears indisputable marks of care, so, for the most part, he has conveyed the meaning of the original authors with fidelity and clearness. That his version is frequently paraphrastical, it has been impossible for us not to notice and lament. His tendency to become a commentator he chiefly evinces by his liberal use of *italics*, and by his clothing in a modern dress some characteristic and metaphorical expressions: and, though for both these practices he may plead the authority of a few very eminent names, we cannot but be of opinion that he is here opposed as well by the majority of able divines as by the rules of solid reasoning and criticism.

In favour of a literal version of the Scriptures, Archbishop Newcome and Dr. Symonds have argued with such excellent sense that we need not apologise for copying their language:

"A translation of the Bible," said the late Primate of Ireland, "should express every word in the original by a literal, verbal, or close rendering, where the English idiom admits of it.

"For thus the translator shews how he reads the original: and not only the matter of the Scriptures, but their peculiar language and manner, will be faithfully represented. The Sacred Writings are of singular importance; they are the rule of our faith and practice: and therefore it is requisite that the reader unskilled in Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek, should always be enabled, as far as the nature of the English language allows, to argue with equal justness from a

translation as scholars do from the original text."*

"The examples of those upon whose judgments we may safely rely, as well as many conclusions arising from the nature of the thing itself," led the late Professor of Modern History at Cambridge "decisively to affirm, that a version of the Bible should be as literal as the difference of language will permit." In support of this position, he adds,

"Though it should be allowed, merely for the sake of argument, that a loose translation may be of sufficient authority in determining matters of faith and practice, yet still it would be liable to an insuperable objection: I mean, the impossibility of furnishing the reader with a just idea of the Original."†

To the principle of these reasonings *Philalethes* does not refuse his assent; for he professes to have made his translation "as literal as, according to his judgment, the idioms of the respective languages would allow." The general rules of translation, indeed, are the same in respect of all languages: by a classical scholar of the highest rank, ‡ those rules are virtually stated in the description which he gives of his own labours: "illud inter alia dedi operam, ut, quantum ejus per utriusque linguae rationes liceret, non discederem a singulorum verborum significatione, nec ab ordine verborum, et figura dictiōnis; sed ipsum quoque genus dicendi, eumque, quem charactera vocant, ex-primerem: quod illis praeceps locis difficultatem habuit, ubi corruptum sermonem ridendo imitatur, et imitando ridiculum facit auctor.—Ubi plane nihil difficultatis erat in Graecis, minus singulorum rationem verborum habuimus.—Voluimus ergo interpretationem nostram Lucianeae orationi, quantum ejus consequi potuimus, esse simillimam."

In a version of the Sacred Writings an adherence to these maxims is more than usually essential. The grand point at issue between *Philalethes* and

* *Histor. View, &c.* p. 256.

† *Observ., &c.* the *Four Gospels*, p. 112.

‡ *J. M. Gesner. Epist. ad J. F. Reitz.* (Lucian. Bipont.)

ourselves, remains therefore to be considered: does his translation conform to the rules that have just been proposed and illustrated? We cheerfully acknowledge that his deviations from them are far less numerous and striking than those which some of his predecessors have exhibited. In 1727 "An Essay for a new translation of the Bible" was published, which should rather have been styled, "An Essay towards an *exposition* of the Scriptures;"* the author having almost uniformly confounded the provinces of the translator and the commentator. Versions of the N. T., which are extremely offensive to the eye of piety and taste, have proceeded from men who appear to have studied in this school. *Philalethes*, however, is a translator of a different spirit and a higher order—not undeserving, indeed, of being compared with the very respectable writers by whose aid we have endeavoured sometimes to justify and sometimes to impugn his renderings. He must pardon us if we think that he would more nearly have resembled the ablest of them had he been less inclined to the use of *paraphrase*.

It is commonly, perhaps, we might say, universally, admitted that *italics* occur too often in the R. V. In the following passages of the translation before us we deem them unnecessary and inexpedient: 1 Thess. ii. 7, 19, iv. 2, 14, 16, v. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 12; Col. i. 6, 9, 27, ii. 18, 21, 22, iii. 21, 24, iv. 4, 6, 11; 1 Tim. i. 1, 4, 6, 7, ii. 2, v. 1, vi. 4, 5, 10, 18, 21; 2 Tim. ii. 1, 4, 24, iii. 5, iv. 8. These are the principal examples of a habit which ought, we presume, to be very cautiously indulged.

Let it next be considered, whether the figurative expressions which present themselves in the Christian Scriptures should be lost sight of in an English version, and "the sense" be given "rather than the words"? We do not mean to intimate that this is the frequent practice of *Philalethes*: still, however, we wish that the instances of it which we shall now point out had not taken place. Why, we

would ask, in Col. iii. 6, does he render the phrase, *τας οὐες της απειθειας* "the disobedient," instead of "the children of disobedience," as in the R. V.? This translation may be met with, it is true, in Castilio and in the F. Genev. Vers.; but we object to it upon principle. As a *comment* it is unexceptionable: yet *Philalethes* does not profess to appear before the world in the character of an *annotator*. Is the English reader furnished in this case with "a just idea of the original"? Are "the peculiar language and manner" of Paul "faithfully represented"? Can any man unacquainted with "the original text" argue with *justness* from *Philalethes'* translation? Has such an individual an advantage, in any degree, "equal" to that of *scholars*? The same questions, we conceive, may fairly be put with reference to our author's version of Col. iii. 12—"merciful dispositions" [σπλαγχνα οικτιρμον]: in R. V., "bowels of mercy." Here again we must pronounce that *Philalethes* has judged rightly as a *Commentator*, but erroneously as a *Translator*. The expression is, no doubt, a Hebraism, Gen. xlvi. 30, &c. &c. And can it be undesirable that the reader not skilled in the oriental dialects have an opportunity of familiarizing himself with peculiarities of this class? Will he not be thus "enabled" to discern with greater clearness the phraseology of Scripture, and to reason from it with more effect? Another of *Philalethes'* renderings now calls for our animadversion, Col. iv. 6, "Let your discourse be always graceful, and seasoned with wisdom:" in R. V., "with salt" [ἀλατι]: in which passage our author has destroyed the integrity of the beautiful figure employed by the apostle. Once more; we have seen that, in 1 Thess. iv. 13, *Philalethes* substitutes the words, "the dead," for "those who are asleep" [κεκοιμημενων]: and we find him rendering a clause in 2 Tim. i. 16, as follows: "he hath not been ashamed of my bonds," [την αλυσιν μου ουκ επησχυθη]. In the latter example, the use of the general term and of the plural number is particularly to be lamented. Wakefield is correct and emphatic, "this chain of mine." Lardner, too, (Works, I. 282,) has made it highly probable that Paul alludes to the specific mode

* See a notice of this work which was not original, in Geddes' *Prospectus*, &c. pp. 85, 86.

of his being kept in custody, agreeably to the Roman custom.

When the language of Scripture is in any measure divested of its native simplicity, its venerable character, we are apprehensive that many readers will distrust the translator, who substitutes for such idioms and figures the current expressions of a polite and learned age. This suspicion and want of confidence, indeed, may not always be just, and certainly would not be so in the present instance; but perhaps it is easier to obviate than to remove these feelings. We have great pleasure in observing that the version under our review, although frequently paraphrastical, is in general concise, and that the style of it is pure and easy. A few exceptions, occasioned by the introduction of words that are too refined, and somewhat exotic, must, nevertheless, be noticed; of this description appear the following: *operateth, reanimated, annulling, impending, intoxicated, operative, parrocides, refractory, duplicity, domestic, verbal, inaccessible, attested, implacable, depraved, continent, corrode, pregnant, verified.* These terms, we know, are now admitted into the English language, and find a place in the pages of some of the best of our modern writers. Should we be asked, why we would banish such expressions from a version of the Scriptures, we reply, "domestic words are preferable to exotic ones, when both are equally used, and both express the same idea;" and the R. V. "should be imitated in every circumstance which produces simplicity, not only because a simple style has exquisite charms for every reader of taste, but also because it is accommodated to ordinary capacities."*

Translators of the Bible, however, are sometimes chargeable with the use of homely and vulgar terms. Examples of this sort may be found in the R. V.: scarcely any are fur-

nished by *PHILAETHES*; and our readers must determine whether he has offended against propriety and taste in the following clause (2 Tim. iv. 3): "to have their sense of hearing tickled" [κυνθημένοι τὴν ακοῦν]: in the R. V. it is, "having itching ears"—in Wakefield, "to sooth their ears," which is not sufficiently literal. We acknowledge the great difficulty of translating such expressions. Nor shall we accuse *Philalethes* of meanness of language; though we doubt whether the rendering in the English Bible be not preferable.

We shall now copy a few passages of his version:

"Representing the invisible God, he [Jesus Christ] is the first-born of the whole creation; for in reference to him were formed all in heaven and upon earth, visible and invisible, whether *occupying the highest stations or subordinate in dignity*; all were made by him and for him, and he is before all, and through him they all subsist. He also is the head of that body the church, and he is the chief, the first-born from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it hath pleased God that in him all that is complete should abide, and that by him all should be reconciled to Himself; *all*, whether upon earth or in heaven, by him who hath made peace by his death on the cross." Col. i. 15—21.

Our next quotation is from the practical part of the same epistle (iii. 18, iv. 2):

"Wives, be submissive to your husbands, as becometh those in union with the Lord. Husbands, love your wives, and be not harsh towards them. Children, be always obedient to your parents, for this is pleasing to the Lord. Fathers, vex not your children by *undue severity*, lest they be discouraged. Servants, always obey those who in temporal concerns are your masters, not with eye-service, as seeking the favour of men, but in sincerity of heart as fearing God; and whatever ye do, perform it heartily, as to the Lord rather than to men, knowing that from the Lord ye are to receive the reward of a *heavenly inheritance*, for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doth wrong shall receive according to the wrong which he hath done, and there is no respect of persons. Masters, give to your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a master in heaven."

The following extract from the Epistle to Titus (ii. 11—15) may not be unacceptable:

* Newcome's Hist. View, &c. pp. 294, 295. It is much to be deplored that, of late years, some foreign words, which violate the analogy of our language, without adding to its elegance, have been introduced among better company than they deserve. The verb "to advocate," v. g. is imported from America. See the Pref. to Ramsey's Hist. of the Am. Rev.

“ — the saving grace of God hath appeared to all men, teaching us to renounce impiety and worldly desires, and to live soberly, and uprightly, and piously, in this present state; looking for the happy object of *our* hope, even the manifestation of the glory of the great God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify for himself a peculiar people, zealous in good works.

We finish our transcripts with a few verses from the Epistle of James (iii. 1—6):

“ My brethren, let not many of you become teachers, considering that we shall undergo a more strict judgment. For in many things we all offend. If any one offend not in word, he is a perfect man, able also to bridle the whole body. Behold we put bits into the mouths of horses, that they may obey us, and we turn their whole frame. Behold also how the ships, though they be so large, and agitated by violent winds, are turned with a very small helm, in whatever direction the steersman pleaseth. Thus the tongue is a little member, and may boast of great things. Behold how large a quantity of materials a small fire kindleth!”

Here we take our leave of *Philalethes*, whom, however, we shall be happy to meet again in the walks of scriptural and theological literature: opportunities for this purpose he will perhaps afford us by a revision and new edition of his present version, and by a translation of some others of the apostolic epistles. We entreat him to believe that our remarks on his labours are offered in the spirit of unfeigned good-will and candour, and under the deepest sense of our own imperfections and fallibility. Declining any thing like altercation with so respectable a writer, we shall gladly receive instruction from his pen. His notes, although properly *few*, are, in general, very pertinent and judicious, and may serve to shew what are some of his opinions concerning points of religious doctrine and discipline; while his translation indicates his acquaintance with the classical authors of antiquity. We think that his characteristic excellence is *perspicuity*; his prevailing error, *a taste for paraphrase*.

May we be permitted again to express our conviction, that no version of the Scriptures for popular use is likely to be effected unless by the

combined labours of *many* scholars? Of the translations executed in our native tongue by any single individual, Newcome's retains most of the simple style of the R. V., and is so far the best; and it was therefore with good reason that the Editors of the I. V. took the learned Primate's as the basis of their valuable work.

ART. III.—*The Peculiar Doctrines of the Gospel: a Sermon preached at the Chapel in Parliament Court, Artillery Lane, London, on Wednesday, June the 2nd, 1819, before the Friends and Supporters of the Unitarian Fund.* By James Yates, M. A. M. G. S., one of the Ministers of the New Meeting Birmingham. 12mo. pp. 32. Hunter and Eaton.

THE Introduction to this sermon will shew that it is peculiarly worthy of perusal and consideration:

Nothing is more common among those of our fellow-christians, who are called *Orthodox*, than to speak of their opinions as the *Peculiar Doctrines of the Gospel*. By this expression they evidently intend to convey the idea, that those opinions are not to be found in any other system of religious belief, and that in the communication of them to mankind the chief and distinguishing value of Christianity consists. Nevertheless we find it repeatedly asserted by the more learned of the orthodox writers, that indubitable traces of these opinions are to be found in the tenets and practices of many heathen nations, and that, although now altered and corrupted in various ways, they appear to have been received from time immemorial over every quarter of the globe.

“ Upon the conquest of America in the 16th century, the Roman Catholic missionaries, who laboured during a great part of their lives to convert the natives of that vast and newly-discovered territory, found that the most essential parts of their system, such as the adoration of Three in One, the Incarnation of the Second Person in the Divine Trinity, and his expiatory sacrifice, were already admitted; and they considered the surprising fact of the reception of these sublime mysteries among tribes so barbarous and so remote, as a splendid omen of success.* That the

* “ ‘That which is difficult in our law to believe,’ says D'Acosta, ‘has been made easy among the Indians, because the Devil had made them comprehend even the self-same things, which he had stolen

same doctrines have been very generally believed among the nations of the *Eastern* world, is asserted with equal confidence, and by a numerous train of esteemed and popular authors. The late Dr. Claudio Buchanan in particular, whose authority respecting facts of this nature stands in the highest repute, and whose information was received a few years since with an avidity and admiration rarely paralleled, states that the ideas of a Tri-une God, and of the Incarnation and Atonement of the Second Person, are current throughout almost the whole of Asia.* What a glaring inconsistency is it, to call these the '*Peculiar Doctrines of Christianity*,' and yet to attempt the confirmation of them by citing the long-established convictions of innumerable heathen nations!"—Pp. 5—7.

After a few further remarks upon the prevalence of these ideas among the Heathens, tending to shew that, even if they *belong to Christianity*, still they are not *confined to Christianity*, Mr. Yates proceeds to state some important principles which are not only maintained by Christians of every denomination to be parts of *their system*, but which never formed a part of *any other system*, and which, therefore, have a strict and indisputable claim to be regarded as **PECULIARITIES** of the gospel. These are the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead; the doctrine that the Love of God is the First and Greatest Commandment; and the injunction of Universal Philanthropy. On these topics the preacher dwells with much seriousness and judgment. He fully establishes his point, and concludes with an animated and powerful appeal to his auditory on behalf of pure Christianity, and of those institutions which guard and promote it. For its excellence as a composition, and for the comparative novelty and, at the

same time, the eminent importance of the subject, the sermon deserves to be widely circulated by means of Unitarian missionaries and Book Societies.

ART. IV.—*Letters from Lexington and the Illinois, containing a Brief Account of the English Settlement in the Latter Territory, and a Refutation of the Misrepresentations of Mr. Cobbett.* By Richard Flower. 8vo. pp. 32. 1s. 1819.

MR. RICHARD FLOWER is an old correspondent of ours, and is well known to many of our readers. He is one of the late Illinois settlers, and his account of the settlement is interesting from his intelligence and probity.

"On a tract of land from the Little Wabash to the Bonpar on the Great Wabash, about seventeen miles in width, and four to six from north to south, there were but a few hunters' cabins, a year and a half since, and now there are about sixty English families, containing nearly four hundred souls; and one hundred and fifty American, containing about seven hundred souls." P. 24. Already a capital is rising, named Albion. A market-house is built, and an inn and a place of worship are building, the latter intended also for a library. Of the land, Mr. Flower, who is a practical agriculturist, speaks in terms of high praise, as he does also of the climate. Indeed, his picture of the country altogether is very inviting, and will, we apprehend, tempt many an industrious family to follow his steps.

The neighbouring capital of Lexington is, as Mr. Flower says, p. 10, "a phenomenon in the history of the world. Twenty-five years since, it was trodden only by the foot of the savage; now it contains about three thousand inhabitants." It has "a college, at which are already one hundred and forty students." Tea-parties, balls, routs, an Athenaeum and a Museum, have taken the place of log cabins and Indian hunts. But slavery is forcibly denounced by this writer as the opprobrium of Kentucky.

The American character generally has made a favourable impression upon Mr. Flower's mind. He speaks with feelings natural to an English Protestant Dissenter of the exemption

from our evangelical law, as their manner of confession, their adoration of Three in One, and such like; the which, against the will of the enemy, have holpen for the easy receiving of the truth.'

"See also the History of California, by Venegas, Vol. I. pp. 88, 92, English Translation; and the History of America, by Dr. Robertson, who cites additional authorities, although, as we might have expected from an heterodox philosopher, he is himself very sceptical upon the subject. Book iv. § 7."

* "Star in the East, 7th Edition, 1810."

of the United States from the burden of a National Church Establishment; but he describes with candour the American Church-of-England clergy:

"The Episcopalian clergy in this country have an enjoyment seldom known in England, that is, being chosen by the people, and supported according to their respective merits; and it is my duty to add, that Episcopilians, as well as the ministers of most other sects, are in general 'labourers worthy of their hire,' virtuous

in their conduct, exemplary in their deportment, exhibiting Christianity in their every-day conduct and intercourse with mankind, and enjoying the esteem of their congregations. There are none of those divines in the busy hive of America, which you know by the name of *dignified clergy*, partaking of the largest revenues, and doing the least possible service,—conduct which one would think must make their heart shudder at the thought of a judgment day!"—Pp 7, 8.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

RELIGIOUS.

Unitarian Quarterly Meeting of Ministers in South Wales.

On the 30th of September last the Unitarian Quarterly Meeting of Ministers was held at Pant-y-defaid, Cardiganshire, whereat J. James, of Gelli-Ounen, preached from Rev. vii. 14; Mr. John Evans, of Carmarthen, preached the preceding evening at Capel-y-Groes, from Col. i. 15; and also Mr. Thomas Evans, of Aberdare, Glamorganshire, from Eph. vi. 13.

The Quarterly Meeting is intended for the open and public discussion of subjects connected with the Christian religion, as well as for preaching: and believing that religious conversation and debates, when properly conducted, are calculated, in an eminent degree, to promote inquiry after truth, and consequently to discover it; to propagate the truths which may have been discovered, and advance the best interests of man; many of those who were zealous supporters of the meetings, always regretted, that two, three, or four long sermons should leave so little time for public conference, even if the patience of the congregation were inexhaustible, and their attention not to be wearied. The advocates of one sermon only at one time were not displeased to observe at Pant-y-defaid, on the 30th, at a very full meeting, a very large majority voting, with uplifted hands, for their proposed alteration, in order that more time might be devoted to the subsequent discussion. The service commenced at ten o'clock, and immediately after it was concluded, Mr. J. Thomas, minister of the place, was unanimously voted to the chair, and the conference began by the introduction of the subject which had been partly discussed at the summer meeting at Llandysaen, and is to be considered at each meeting till it shall have been discussed in every meeting-house in the circle, viz. What are the best Rules to be observed in the Chris-

tian Church? Though the debate was prolonged till between three and four o'clock, the meeting-house was almost full to the last, and very few, comparatively speaking, left the place till the Chairman quitted the chair; and all seemed to be very attentive throughout. The next meeting to be held at Merthyr, December 30, Mr. J. Davies, Capel-y-Groes, to preach.

J. JAMES.

October 15, 1819.

Liverpool Unitarian Fellowship Fund Society.

AT a Meeting of the Committee of the Liverpool Unitarian Fellowship Fund Society, held in the vestry of the Unitarian Chapel, Renshaw Street, on Sunday, November 14, 1819, it was unanimously resolved,

"That feeling a deep and lively interest in the cause of Unitarianism at Madras, we have witnessed, with great pleasure, the resolutions of the Fellowship Funds of Longborough and Mount Sorrel, of Exeter and Sheffield; and are ready and willing to co-operate with them and the other Fellowship Fund Societies already established in the kingdom, for the purpose of carrying into effect the important objects suggested in the second letter of William Roberts to the Unitarian Society."

GEORGE HARRIS, Secretary.

The Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Christian Association.

AT a General Meeting of the Unitarian Christians of Lancashire and Cheshire, held in the Unitarian Chapel, Renshaw Street, on Tuesday, October 19th, 1819; Ottiwell Wood, Esq., in the Chair, it was unanimously resolved to establish a General Association of the Unitarian Christians of Lancashire and Cheshire, and the following preamble and rules were adopted.

Preamble.

Unitarian Christians believe the doctrines they profess, to be the perfection of reason, and the glory of revelation; they conceive their views of divine truth to be honourable to the Deity and ennobling to man; they know that their direct tendency is to inspire the purest reverence of God, and the most lively aspirations after holiness; they feel them to be cheering in the hour of prosperity, and consolatory in the moment of adversity; that they elevate the mind above the vicissitudes of life, and fill the heart with peaceful hope on the approach of death.

It is their sincere and solemn conviction that many doctrines maintained by other denominations of Christians, if pursued into all their consequences, would produce effects totally opposite to those professed by the Unitarian Christian. They indeed rejoice in the conviction, that in numerous instances such effects are not produced. They love the piety of many of their brethren and applaud their zeal. But they are convinced that that zeal would burn with a purer flame, and that piety glow with a more divine ardour, were they with earnestness and feeling to embrace those views of divine truth which the Unitarian maintains. Unitarian Christians therefore cannot but think and feel, that if they are generous and benevolent and virtuous, it is their imperative duty to display this pure system of truth and righteousness before the eyes of their fellow-christians, in its genuine and native light.

These are the reasons which have led to the formation of *The Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Christian Association*. Its objects are to promote the honour of God and the happiness of man. Its means of producing these great and good effects, those sanctioned by the Anointed of the Most High; the sending persons to and from that knowledge may be increased; and its justification (if any should be deemed necessary) the solemn and expressive language of that great Being, who declared, "No man when he hath lighted a candle, putteth it in a secret place, neither under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that they which come in may see the light."

Rules.

1. That it is a most desirable object to form and maintain a regular correspondence with the different religious societies in Lancashire and Cheshire, which are united on the common principles of the strict unity of God, and of his universal love to his creatures.

2. That no means appear to be better adapted to accomplish that object, than the institution of a General Association of those religious societies, to be held alternately at the places in which such societies exist, and maintaining a correspondence

with each other through the medium of a committee.

3. That such an Association is calculated not only to unite the societies themselves in a spirit of friendship most worthy and illustrative of the Christian name, but will also tend to check the progress of infidelity, and will likewise afford an excellent opportunity to explain to the public the real principles avowed by Unitarian Christians; to expose the misrepresentations which are circulated respecting them, and to remove the unjust imputations too frequently cast upon them by many of their fellow-christians.

4. That a General Association of the Unitarian Christians of Lancashire and Cheshire be therefore established, to be denominated "*The Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Christian Association*."

5. That the objects of this institution are, 1. To promote and keep up an intercourse and correspondence between the different religious societies in Lancashire and Cheshire, which are united upon the common principles of the strict unity of God, and of his universal love to his creatures. 2. To co-operate with the (*London*) *Unitarian Fund*, in promoting the principles of Unitarian Christianity by means of popular preaching; by the employment of permanent missionaries in the two counties; by forming districts for preaching around the populous towns; by promoting the interchange of ministers; by supplying those congregations which are destitute of ministers; and by the distribution of tracts in those places to which the missionaries are sent.

6. That this Association shall be supported by donations from the congregational Fellowship Funds, and by individual subscriptions.

7. That with a view to carry into effect the objects of the Association, the different Fellowship Funds in the two counties are requested to transmit to it a sum of money annually, according to their respective resources, to be placed at the disposal of the Association.

8. That every member of any Fellowship Fund connected with the Association, shall be considered a member of this Association, and his presence shall entitle him to vote.

9. That in every town and village in Lancashire and Cheshire where there are any Unitarians, the friends be requested, if they have not previously done so, to form themselves into societies, to be denominated, "*The Unitarian Fellowship Association Fund*."

10. That the Secretaries of the respective Fellowship Funds be requested with the advice and confirmation of the members, before whom their reports must be previously read, to send an annual account of

the state and progress of Unitarianism in their respective neighbourhoods, at least one month before the annual meeting to the Secretary of the Association, in order that he may lay it before the general body.

11. That an Annual General Meeting of the Association shall be held in the month of June or July, subject to the direction of the Committee, when a Report of the Committee for the past year shall be read, and the officers of the Society elected for the ensuing year.

12. That at the General Meeting a sermon shall be preached before the Society, by a minister previously appointed by the Committee, when a collection shall be made for the benefit of the Association.

13. That the management of the affairs of the Institution be vested in a Committee of twelve persons, including the Secretary and Treasurer, that five be competent to act, and that the Committee meetings be open to all subscribers.

14. That two members of the Association be appointed to audit the Treasurer's accounts before they are submitted to the Society at the Annual Meeting.

15. That the Committee shall be chosen annually, and from the place where the last meeting of the Association is held; (but, that the Committee to be now elected shall continue in office till the Annual Meeting in 1821).

16. That the Committee shall have the power, in cases of emergency, to call an extraordinary General Meeting of the subscribers.

17. That at the General Meeting of the Association, the Committee be at liberty to recommend, as honorary members, such persons as by their advice and services shall have rendered themselves particularly useful to the Society.

18. That the foregoing rules shall not be altered, except at a General Meeting, and any alterations intended to be proposed to the Society, must be first notified to the Committee one month previously to the Annual Meeting.

19. That every question which shall come before the Association shall be determined by a majority of votes.

That the following persons constitute the Committee.

Mr. WILLIAM ROBINSON, *Treasurer.*

Rev. GEORGE HARRIS, *Secretary.*

Mr. THOS. Fletcher, Mr. Joseph Wild,
L. J. Jardine, M. D. Mr. J. W. Wood,
Mr. W. Lewthwaite, Mr. Ottiwell Wood,
Mr. J. Littlewood, Mr. F. B. Wright,
Mr. H. Taylor, Rev. John Yates.

That the Preamble and Rules be printed, and copies forwarded to every minister and congregation in the two counties.

OTTIWELL WOOD, *Chairman,*
GEORGE HARRIS, *Secretary.*

That the thanks of the meeting be given to Ottiwell Wood, Esq., for his admirable conduct in the Chair.

Chesterfield Fellowship Fund.

At the Annual Meeting held on the first Sunday in the month of June, 1819, for electing fresh officers, passing the accounts, &c. &c., the Rev. Robert Wallace was elected President, Mr. John Woodhead Treasurer, and Mr. Thomas Woodhead Secretary for the year ensuing.

It was resolved, That, besides the Annual Meeting held as above, there should be three Quarterly ones, viz. on the first Sundays in the months of September, December, and March, notice of which should be given on the preceding Lord's day.

It was also resolved, That a subscription of two pounds per annum be sent to the Treasurer of the Unitarian Fund, in aid of that excellent institution;—being at once expressive of our cordial approbation and hearty concurrence with the objects contemplated by that Society.

At the Half-yearly Meeting of subscribers to the Fund, held on the first Sunday of December, 1819,

It was resolved, first, That this Fellowship most heartily co-operates with the Committees of the Loughborough and Mountsorrel, and also with the Exeter, Lincoln, Liverpool, Sheffield and other Fellowship Funds, who have so generously come forward to assist our brethren, the "Native Unitarian Christians of Madras," in propagating the uncorrupted doctrines of Christianity in that part of the world. And as a proof of our zeal in the great cause, we vote the sum of three pounds out of our little Fund, to be remitted to them for that purpose, through the medium of Dr. Thomas Rees, Secretary to the Unitarian Society; or in any other manner which may be thought more convenient. And that we shall always feel happy in affording them such further support as the circumstances of our Fund will admit of.

It was resolved, secondly, That the sum of two pounds shall be immediately sent to the Committee of the Boston Unitarian Congregation, to be by them appropriated towards erecting a new and more commodious Unitarian chapel at Boston, than the one which the congregation at present assemble in.

THOMAS WOODHEAD.

Chesterfield, Dec. 19, 1819.

Anti-Baptists.

THE late controversy amongst the Calvinistic Baptists on Forms of Communion, has led some of them, as we expected, to deny the perpetuity of Baptism altogether. A pamphlet on this subject, entitled

"Thoughts on Baptism, as an Ordinance of Proselytism," has just appeared, under the signature of *Agnostos*; and from another pamphlet, entitled "A Letter to a Member of the Church meeting in Stafford Street, Dublin," by *Vindex*, we learn that the religious society here described, together with other affiliated societies in Ireland, are declared Anti-Baptists. The "New Evangelical Magazine" is looking after these novel heretics.

Romish Index.

In the *Index Expurgatorius* or list of prohibited books, by the Papal See, have been inserted two works of Mr. Gandalphy's, a Catholic clergyman in London. The books were *presented* or informed against by Dr. Poynter, the vicar apostolic. Mr. Gandalphy is charged with various errors, approaching to heresy; one is, that "the souls of infants dying without baptism are not to be condemned to eternal punishment." Like a good Catholic, he promises to submit to the high spiritual authorities, and to suppress the objectionable passages.

Proceedings of Catholics on Public Distress.

DOCTOR MILNER, vicar apostolic for the midland district, has addressed a pastoral letter to his flock, exhorting them to peace and loyalty. He says that the poor are worse off every where else, and even in America than here; that our present evils are the unavoidable consequences of the late necessary war; and that "every revolutionary measure" would increase the sufferings of the poor in a tenfold degree. He maintains that corruption is inseparable from government, *Ubi homo ibi culpa*. And he reminds his people of the revolution in France, which led to war not only against the throne, but also against the altar.

At Manchester the Catholic clergy have forbidden the children in their schools to appear in *white hats* or with any other sign of affection to the principles of radical reform.

There is a Catholic magazine called "The Orthodox Journal," published monthly, price one shilling, which animadverts very strongly upon these measures; and the Editor, W. E. Andrews, has been denounced from the pulpit as a radical, and his work is threatened to be put down by the authority of the Church.

MISCELLANEOUS.

MR. JOHN WRIGHT, late of Liverpool, and now of George Town, near Wash-

ton, in a letter, dated October 21st, 1819 requests that, for the satisfaction of his friends, and in justice to himself, we would insert a positive denial of his having deserted the *Unitarian Cause* and the people whom he has been the means of collecting. Such a statement, he says, must have been sent to England by some one who deliberately strove to injure him in the opinion of his English friends. But to refute the calumny and to remove the injurious impressions which may have been made, he has been advised to send the following testimony, subscribed by *ten* of his friends, with some of whom we are personally acquainted.

To Mr. John Wright's Unitarian Friends in England:

"We, the undersigned, connected with Mr. John Wright in the Unitarian Cause, and witnesses of his unremitting exertions to spread the same by every public and private means in his power, learn with regret, that impressions have by some means been made on some of his friends in England; purporting that he had relinquished the great work in which he had been engaged, and given up his office as minister of the Unitarian Society in George Town.

"We, therefore, deem it incumbent on us to contradict such unfounded report, and to vindicate Mr. W. against such unmerited aspersion, and to assure our brethren in England, from our own observation and knowledge, that no man can be more zealous or more ready to make every possible exertion to spread the knowledge of the *One True God*; or less disposed to desert his post than Mr. Wright; he having persevered under the most trying circumstances and against the bitterest opposition.

Benjamin Mayfield, R. Sehair,
Thomas C. Wright, William Cammack,
Daniel Carter, M. Downs,
M. Young, Joseph Foreman,
William Elliot, Ed. Cammack."

Methodist Declaration of Loyalty.

THE Committee for guarding the religious privileges of the Wesleyans has issued a manifesto, warning the persons in connexion with them to avoid all political associations on pain of being disowned by the preachers. As the preachers constitute the Conference, so the laity form the committee. Their circular has been publicly denounced by advertised resolutions in the papers of some of the Methodists of Norwich, as presumptuous, intolerant, and contrary to the Methodist constitution.

FOREIGN.

FRANCE.

A considerable emotion has been excited in France by a tumult occasioned at BREST, by the appearance of a company of Catholic missionaries. [The character of these missionaries is given p. 701.] The mob is said to have risen upon them, and to have used them very harshly. Irreligious cries are also said to have proceeded from the populace. The people of Brest are hence accused in the Paris papers of impiety. It is reported, as a further instance of their profaneness, that when Mademoiselle Georges appeared at the Theatre of that town, all covered and blazing with diamonds, some persons began to sing the *Adoremus*, and this being ended, the canticle of *Sur cet autel, ah! que vois je paroître!*

A *Paris* correspondent of ours says in a letter of the 8th instant, "The Jesuits are busy here and throughout France. There have been some tumults at BREST, in consequence of the intolerant barbarism of the missionaries. Their friends are as a cipher against millions; but there is no miserable intrigue that is not at work for them.—LLORENTI has been deprived of his privilege of saying mass at his parish church, because of his books on the *Inquisition* and the *Concordat*."

The Abbé GREGOIRE continues to excite public attention. He has been prevented from taking his seat in the Chamber of Deputies. But he will not voluntarily betray his constituents. Before the decision for his exclusion, he addressed to them an interesting letter (*Lettre aux Electeurs du Département de l'Isère*) breathing the pure spirit of liberty and the gospel. He says he goes to take his seat beside the veteran of freedom, (La Fayette,) who has so gloriously defended it in both worlds. The following passage we translate as a specimen of this Election-Address:—

"*Religious Hatred.*—This expression, taken literally, is an absurdity; for it connects ideas which are incapable of connexion. That hatred which murdered Catholics in Ireland, and Protestants in the South of France, and which, beyond the Rhine, is now persecuting the children of Israel, would seek in vain its justification in the gospel; would attempt in vain to render the gospel the accomplice of those crimes on which its malediction falls. Religion has no other arms than truth to convince the mind, and charity to subdue the heart: we are deceived if, in-

stead of contemplating religion in her own form, we are resolved to view her through the habits and conduct of some of her ministers."—Pp. 10, 11.

A new periodical publication has appeared at Paris, entitled *Annales Protestantes: A Miscellany specially devoted to the Defence of the Reformed Religion. By a Society of Protestants and of Men of Letters.* The first Number, (for October, 1819,) has been sent to us, and we are happy to recommend this specimen of the work, on account both of its talents and spirit. The deluge of the French Revolution is succeeded by a freshness and sweetness which are grateful to the heart. The French have paid the price of liberty and know its value.

GERMANY.

A novelty appeared last year at Dessau, a Selection (in 8vo.) of *Sermons for Israelites* (Auswahl mehrerer predigten, &c.), by G. SALOMON. These Jewish Sermons, preached at Dessau, are on the following subjects: Concord, Causes of Unbelief, Reflections upon the new Year, Characters that distinguish the People of Israel, Vanity of earthly Good, Trust in Divine Providence.

HANOVER.

The Prince Regent of this kingdom "in consequence of the resolutions passed by the German Diet," has issued an ordinance subjecting the press to a rigorous censorship. How uniform is this hatred of princes, and especially German princes, to the press! There would, we fear, be sedition in the answer to the question, why they hate it.

HOLLAND.

M. VAN DER PALM, professor of oriental literature in the University of Leyden, and minister of a congregation there, well known by his volumes of excellent sermons and his translation of *Isaiah*, has announced a *New Dutch Version of the Bible*, and in less than six months has received more than two thousand subscriptions. The *First Part* is published and is well received. It consists of 276 pp. 4to, and contains the five Books of Moses. The Version is accompanied by short notes. M. Van der Palm adopts the hypothesis that Moses used in the composition of the Pentateuch, and especially of the book of Genesis, ancient original memoirs, preserved by songs or some other means in the patriarchal families.

A

GENERAL INDEX

or

SUBJECTS AND SIGNATURES.

* * The Names and Signatures of *Correspondents* are distinguished by Small Capitals or Italics: as different Correspondents have often adopted the same signature, some ambiguity in the references will unavoidably arise; but this is an inconvenience necessarily attached to anonymous communications.

A.

A.'s memoir of Dr Cogan, 1, 74.
 His hymn on virtue, 46. His hymn to the Deity, *ib.*, 577. His morning hymn, 191. His lines to a violet, *ib.* On the Corporation and Test Acts, 426. His hymn on eternity, 577. His sonnet on court sycophants, 637
 A. B.'s inquiry respecting the Ebionite Gospel, 245. On the Jews' embassy to Cromwell, 410
 Abbot, Mr. Andrew, obituary of, 706
 Abney's, Sir Thomas, conformity on, 723
 Adams, Mr. John, his character of Dr Jonathan Mayhew, 296
 African Woman, lines by an, 191
 Aged and Infirm Ministers' Society, on the, 661
 A. L.'s obituary of Mr. William Leishman, 510
 Alexander, Emperor of Russia, his reply to the address of the Chairman of the Committee of the Peace Society, 305
 Alphasi, Isaac, translation of the Hebrew inscription on the tomb of, (note,) 348
 A. M.'s memoir of the Rev. Benjamin Goodier, 69,
 AMERICAN CITIZEN, AN, on the lawfulness of defensive war amongst Christians, 149
 American Episcopal Liturgy, on the, 407

American Unitarian Controversy, reviewed, 703
 American war, anecdotes of the British opposers of the, 152
 Anabaptism in the Church of England, on, 406, 721
 Anecdotes of Charles II. and James II., from Evelyn, 156
 ANGELUS on the American Episcopal Liturgy, 407
 Animal food, on the new sect of abstinents from, 312
 ANON. on the prevailing diversity of opinions, 101
 Anti Catholic proceedings, 273
 Anti-Deist, The, reviewed, 572
 Anti-Jacobin Review, amusing passages from the, 716
 Anti-trinitarian French King, 560
 "Apeleutherus," sonnet from, 47.
 Sonnets to reason and benevolence from, 190. On some of the arguments in, with regard to the natural evidences of a future state, 221
 Apostles' Creed, strictures on the, 435
 Appeal, right of, 200
 Appeal to Scripture and Tradition in Defence of the Unitarian Faith, reviewed, 431, 500
 APPOINTMENTS AND REMOVALS OF MINISTERS, 273, 456
 Arbuthnot and Ambrister, committee's report on the execution of, 278
 Arianism, remarks on, 500—502. On the extinction of, 729

INDEX.

A.

ARMSTRONG, Mr., on the Warwick Unitarian chapel, 479
A. R. Y.'s names of the voters in the Salters' Hall Synod, 16
 Ashworth, Mr., on the annual association of Methodist Unitarians at Newchurch, &c., 516
 ASPLAND, Rev. Mr., on the Greenock subscription, 30. His two letters to the Editor of the *Times*, relating to the Unitarians, 707
 ASTLEY, Rev. R., on Dr. Thomson's monument, 692
 Athanasian Creed, strictures on the, 435
 Athanasianism and Deism, on, 406
 Athanasius, a Greek Christian at Smyrna, martyrdom of, 649
 Atkinson, Joseph, Esq., lines for the monument of, 118
 Atonement, explanation of the word, 285. Suggestions on behalf of the doctrine of, 356. On, 503, 504, 550, 552, 730
 Attempt (An) to support the Diversity of Future Rewards, reviewed, 328
 Audran, M. Prosper-Gabriel, obituary of, 704

B.

B.'s review of Estrada's Defence of the *Cortes*, 189. His account of his interview with the Abbé Greigoire, 225. His sketch of the history and literature of the Spanish Jews, 345. On the Rev. Samuel Newton's Objection to the Improved Version, 401, 480, 534, 625. On the composition of Unitarian Hymn-books, 466
 Buckus's History of New England, extract from, 99
 Bacon's Historical Discourse of the Uniformity of the Government of England, extract from, 555
 Baker's Chronicle, extract from, (note,) 25
 Bampton Lecturer reproved, The, reviewed, 495
 Baptism, D. on, 32, 232, 608. Denial of the perpetuity of, 766
 Baptismal commission, on the, 599
 Baptist, definition of the term, 337
 Baptists, an inquiry into the principles and conduct of the, respecting civil and religious liberty, 92
 Barelay, Robert, quotations from his *Apology*, 150, 303
 BARHAM, Mr., his suggestions on behalf of the doctrine of the atonement, 356, 730
 Bedford Charity, 518. Lord Chancellor's judgment on the, 578
 Believer and unbeliever, difference between the, 258
 Bellamy's Anti-Deist, reviewed, 572

BELSHAM, Rev. Mr., on the Greenock subscription, 30, 125. D. on his "Plea for Infant Baptism," 32, 232, 608. His *Reflections upon the Death of Sir Samuel Romilly*, reviewed, 264. Mr. Browne on the dedication of his tract on Religious Liberty to, 300. His Reply to Dr. Moysey, reviewed, 495. On the original principle of the Unitarian Society, 657
 Benevolence, sonnet to, 190. On the pleasures of, 325
 Bennet's, (Hon. H. G.) Letter to Viscount Sidmouth, on the Transportation Laws, &c., reviewed, 261
 Bennett, Mrs. obituary of, 194
 Bennett's Sermon before the Southern Unitarian Book Society, reviewed, 266
 BEREA, A JEW OF, on the prophets, Christ, and his apostles idolaters! 165
 BERECS on the state of religion at Hereford, 366
 Bey, Ali, obituary of, 270
 Bible, brief notes on the, 42, 116, 320, 413, 475, 544, 615, 725
 BIBLICAL CRITICISM, 41, 109, 315
 Blasphemy, prosecutions for, 129, 645
 B. M.'s obituary of Robert Smith, Esq., 192
 Boston, new Unitarian chapel at, 199. Messrs. Wright and Lyons on, 687
 Botanical elucidations of Scripture, 607
 Bowdler on the Punishment of Death in the case of Forgery, reviewed, 267
 B. R. D.'s obituary of Mrs. Jane Manley, 705. Of Miss Mary Cannon, 705
 Bretland, Rev. Joseph, obituary of, 445. On his publications, &c., 473. Notice of a memoir of, 494. Character of, 559
 Brett's Narrative of the Proceedings of a great Council of Jews, information respecting, 136, 290
 BREVIS's inquiry respecting Newton and Locke, 19. His brief notes on the Bible, 42, 116, 320, 413, 475, 544, 615, 725. On the assault of the Fort of Nowah, 616, 734
 Bridel's new Translation of the Book of Job, account of, 423
 Bridport Fellowship Fund, the establishment of, 154
 Brief History of the Unitarians, The, passages from, 533
 Brighton Unitarian Chapel, appeal to the public in behalf of the, 127. State of, 638
 Brilliant vice, 315
 Brotherton, Mr., his account of the new sect of abstainers from animal food, 313
 BROWNE, MR. THEOPHILUS, on an instance of bigotry at Gloucester, 18. His Religious Liberty, &c. re-

viewed, 266. On the dedication of his Religious Liberty, &c. to Mr. Belsham, 300. His tribute to the memory of Mr. William Saint, 493. Buchanan's "Researches," on a passage in, 288, 372. Buonaparte's Unitarian project, on, 31, 225. Burchardt, Rev. Christopher, obituary of, 270. Burdett's, Sir Francis, remarks on irreligion and blasphemy, 714. Burghers and Antiburghers, on the union of the, 366. Burke's letter on the repeal of the penal laws affecting the Catholics, 439. Butchers and soldiers, 560. B. Y. on Dr. Walker and the Quakers, 366. Byron, Lord, his Ode on Venice, 442.

C.

Calcutta, establishment of a Hindoo College at, 343. Calvin's notion of the Sabbath, 424, 488, 553, 665. Calvinists, on the moral system of, 404. Cambrian Society, establishment of the, 206. Cambridge, bigotry of several of its members, 586. Considerations respecting, extract from, 607. Cannon, Miss Mary, obituary of, 705. Canterbury, Archbishop, on his charge to the clergy of the county of Kent, 518. CAPPE, Mrs., on the review of Mr. Wellbeloved's Sermon, 291. On Mr. Holley's popular preaching and liberal sentiments, 355. On the character of Mr. Emlyn, 490. Cappe's, Rev. Mr., Memoirs, recommended, 408, 494. Reply to E. F.'s suggestion on, 623. Carlile's trials, remarks on, 645. Sentence, 714. On the prosecution of, 727. CARPENTER, Dr., on divine influences and conversion, 419, 545, 617. On proceedings in the Western Unitarian Society, 744. Carpenter, Messrs. John and Thomas, obituary of, 399. Cartwright, Thomas, biography of, 27. Case decided on a Dissenter's claim of exemption from toll on a Sunday, 58. On a dispute between the Methodists in Ireland, 127. Case of One of a Hundred, 80. Catholics, the, on the division of the Decalogue by, 299, 467. Proceedings of, on public distress, 767. Catholic religion in Sweden, 543. C. D. on the division of the Decalogue, 467. Channing's Sermon at the Ordination of the Rev. Jared Sparks, reviewed, 635. Notice of, 648. Chapels, best plans of, 545. Character of Dr. Doddridge in verse, 181. Character of Louis XIV., 108. Charles II., Evelyn's description of incidents in the reign of, 22. And James II., anecdotes of, from Evelyn, 156. Charleston, in South Carolina, late religious proceedings at, 241. Chester Guardian, lines from the, 47. Chichester Fellowship Fund, on the establishment of the, 302. Children's hymn, 118. Chimney-Sweepers' Bill, on the, 206. Christ. See Jesus Christ. Christian and Pagan Trinities, on, 540. Christian charities, right of Jews to share in, 578. Christianity, argument in favour of, 259. On the design of, in its application to future punishment, 485. Christian religion, reasonableness of the, 259. Christians, lawfulness of defensive war amongst, 149, 303, 400, 409. Christian Tract Society Anniversary, 199. Christie, Mr. William, on the lawfulness of defensive war amongst Christians, 149. Christmas Day, observance of, in the United States, 523. Chronique Religieuse, translation from, on the present state of religious sects in Sweden, 541. Church of England, late Seceders from the, 21. On Anabaptism in the, 406, 721. On the controverted clause in the twentieth article of the, 461. Its constitution, 753. Church Union Society's premiums in the diocese of St. David's, 202, 586. CLARKE, Mr., on his School for Scriptural Christians, 39. Clarke, William, Esq., legacies by the late, 648. CLERICUS on Deism and Athanasianism, 406. C. N. S.'s obituary of Mr. Samuel Cravan, 192. Of Mr. William Walton, 651. Cogan, Dr., memoir of, 1, 74, 105. His letter to the secretary to the Unitarian Fund, 74. List of his publications, 76. COGAN, Mr., on Mr. Stodhart's anti-themas against Unitarians, 164. His strictures on some of the arguments in "Apeleutherus," with regard to the natural evidences of a future state, 221. His Sermons, reviewed, 257, 323. On the eternity of hell torments, 369. On the moral system of Calvinists, 494.

INDEX.

His Sermon on the death of Miss Elizabeth Solly, reviewed, 442. On the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Society, 733
 Collins's conformity, on, 723
 Collins on Literal Prophecy, anecdote from, 410
 Commercial oaths, on, 491, 670. Liverpool memorial on, 646. Bristol memorial on, 647
 Commonwealth, copy of a certificate of marriage under the, 153, 291
 Commonwealth Marriage Act, the, 357
 Constant's Eulogium on Sir Samuel Romilly, reviewed, 263. His characters of Fox and Pitt, 538
 CONSTANT READER, A, his questions on the marriage ceremony, 159
 Convocation, Mr. Prebendary Dennis's petition to the, 274
 CORNISH, Mr., on the decline of Presbyterian congregations, 77
 Cornwall's Dramatic Scenes, extract from, 577
 Corporation and Test Acts, on the, 426
 CORRESPONDENCE, 68, 136, 212, 280, 344, 400, 460, 524, 588, 652, 716, 784
 CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN LOCKE AND LIMBORCH, 9, 146, 217
 Country life, thoughts on a, 668
 Coventry, ministers of the Presbyterian congregation at, 120
 Cowling, Mrs., obituary of, 192
 Cravan, Mr. Samuel, obituary of, 187
 Criminal Laws, Favell's Speech on the, reviewed, 430
 Curran's Life, extracts from, 430

D.

D. on Mr. Belsham's "Plea for Infant Baptism," 32, 232, 608
 Davy, Sir Humphry, his report of the state of the Herculaneum MSS. 279
 Death, on the fear of, 183. On the Punishment of, in the Case of Forgery, reviewed, 267
 Decalogue, on the division of the, 299, 467
 Defensive war, on, 149, 303, 400, 409, 725
 Deism and Athanasianism, on, 406
 Dendy, Mrs. Sarah, obituary of, 650
 Denmark, public affairs, &c., of, 343, 587
 Deprivation of a clergyman by the Archbishop of York, 584
 Derby, Nottingham, and the South of Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting, 59
 Des Maizeaux's Life of Chillingworth, extracts from, 556
 Devotion, the virtuous and happy influence of, 323
 DILLON, Mr., his account of his protest against the marriage ceremony, 179
 Discourse on Excommunication, reviewed, 441

Dissent, abstract argument for, 754
 Dissenter's, A, claim of exemption from toll on a Sunday, 58
 Divine influences and conversion, on, 367, 419, 476, 477, 545, 617, 622, 675
 Divine paternity, on Voltaire's representation of the, 483
 Divine Unity, immense importance of the doctrine of the, 755
 Doddridge, Dr., character of, in verse, 181
 Doddridge's Family Expositor, extract from, 151
 DOMINICUS on the distinction of Sabbath and Lord's-days, 424. On Calvin's notion of the Sabbath, 553
 Dover, ceremony of laying the first stone of the new Unitarian General Baptist Chapel at, 337
 Down, Bishop of, extract from his sermon preached before Charles II. 525
 Dudley Double Lecture Anniversary, 516

E.

E. on the "fire-act London clergy," 166
 Early Christians, nonconformity of the, 308
 Early Unitarian Christian writers, 306
 Eastern Unitarian Society Anniversary, 386. Report of its Committee, 386
 E. B.'s obituary of Miss Sarah Saxton, 195
 Ebionite gospel, inquiry respecting the, 245
 E. D. on the General Baptist Assembly Anniversary, 376
 Edinburgh, high mass and abuse of "Socinians" at Edinburgh, 20. Outrage at, 21, 63. State of Unitarianism in, 61
 EDITOR, on the royal farce of touching for the evil, 22 (*note*). On foreign intelligence, 131. On the memoir of the late Mr. G. W. Meadley, 137. On the Rev. B. Goodier's contributions, 145 (*note*). On the lawfulness of defensive war amongst Christians, 149, 303. On the late religious proceedings at Charleston, in South Carolina, 242. On the death of Mr. James Rait, 269. On the character of Dr. Jonathan Mayhew, 296. On a passage in the Lord Chancellor's judgment on the Bedford charity, 582 (*note*). On the correspondence in the Times Newspaper, relating to the Unitarians, 707
 E. F. on Cappe's Memoirs, 494
 Ellis, Mr. John, obituary of, 651
 Emigration, on the excess of, 274
 Emlyn, Mr. Thomas, on the character of, 490
 Eneoufre, Dr., obituary of, 260

England, parliamentary affairs of, 202, 275, 714. Description of the majesty of, 753
 English Catholics, petition from the, 204
 Epicure, pulpit picture of the, 630
 Erskine, Dr. John, Sir H. Moncrieff Wellwood's Life of, reviewed, 439
 E. S. on the Roman Catholic Prayer Book omitting the second commandment, 164. On the design of Christianity in its application to future punishment, 485
 Essentials of a National Church briefly explained, &c, reviewed, 435
 Essex-Street Psalms, on a passage in the, 532
 Established Church of Ireland, motion for inquiring into the state of the, 275
 Estrada's Defence of the Cortes, reviewed, 189
 E. T.'s memoir of J. J. Wetstein, 248
 Eternal torments, on the subject of, 499
 EUELPIS on the doctrine of universal restitution, 87. On the Reformed Jews, 371. On final restitution, 484
 EVANS, Mr., on the obituaries of Mr. T. Thomas and D. J. Rees, 103
 EVANS, Rev. J., [LL.D.,] his address to the managers and subscribers of the Wood-street, Spitalfields, charity school, 56. His Sermon on the Causes, Evils and Remedy of False Shame in the Affairs of Religion, reviewed, 635
 Evelyn's description of incidents in the reign of Charles II., 22. His anecdotes of Charles II. and James II., 156. Mr. Evelyn a Reformer, 229. Extract from his Memoirs, 373
 Exeter Fellowship Fund, resolution of the, 584

F.

F.'s review of A plain Discourse on Excommunication, 441. On the controverted clause in the twentieth article of the Church of England, 461
 FAIRBRIDGE, Mr., on the omission of 1 John v 7, in a Latin Version of the New Testament, 599
 Fallen man, 630
 Fate of Revolutions, 430
 FATHER, A, on matriculation at the Universities, 287
 Favell's Speech on the Criminal Laws, reviewed, 187
 F. B. on the doctrine of atonement, 552
 FEARON, Mr., on his protest against the marriage ceremony, 272
 FELLOWSHIP FUNDS, established in Bridport, 126. In York, *ib.* In Chesterfield, 126. In Crediton, *ib.* In Somers Town, 127. In Bridport, 154. In Dudley, 273. In Chichester, *ib.* In Whitechurch, 396. In Stockton-upon-Tees, *ib.* In Bristol, 455. In Loughborough and Mountsorrel, 456. In Taunton, 584. Mr. T. Fisher on, 414
 FENNELL, Mr., on Barclay's judgment on defensive war, 303, 409
 Final restitution, on, 82, 86, 293, 370, 484
 "Fire-act London clergy," 166, 202, 275
 FISHER, Mr. T., on fellowship funds, 414
 FISHER, Mr. T. E., on his protest against the marriage ceremony, 340
 F. K. on marriage protests, 303
 FLOWER, Mr. B., on Dr. Walker's treatment of Scripture, 162. On the state of religion in Kentucky, 242
 Flower, Mr. R., extracts from his Letters on the State of Religion in Kentucky, 242. His Letters from the Illinois, reviewed, 763
 Flushing, opening of the Unitarian Chapel at, 338
 FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE, 64, 131, 207, 277, 342, 397, 457, 521, 587, 648, 767
 Fox and Pitt, characters of, 538
 Fex's, Rev. W. J., Sermon on the Duties of Christians towards Deists, reviewed, 701. His Lectures reviewed, 752
 France, public affairs, &c, of, 64, 131, 207, 277, 457, 521, 587, 648, 767
 Francis, Sir Philip, obituary of, 65
 Frankland, Mrs., obituary of, 194
 Free and slavish writers, 256
 Freedom, from the German, 191
 French Protestants, address of the committee for the relief of the persecuted, 374
 FREND, Mr., on the gradations of intellect, 545. On the origin of the Unitarian Society, 743
 FULLAGAR, Mr., on the Worship of Christ, reviewed, 190. On the establishment of the Chichester Fellowship Fund, 302. On Sir Samuel Romilly, 410. His Letter to Lloyd, reviewed, 508
 Future life, silence of the Old Testament on, 364. Wright's Essay on a, reviewed, 575
 Future punishment, on, 90. On the design of Christianity in its application to, 485
 Future rewards and punishments, on, 369
 Future Rewards, an Attempt to support the Diversity of, reviewed, 328
 Future state, on the natural evidences of a, 221, 293

G.

Gainsborough Unitarian Association, Wellbeloved's Sermon before the, reviewed, 184. Its Half-yearly Meeting, 272, 638

Gaskell, Mr. H. and Rev. Mr. Molineux, correspondence between, 286

Gaskell, Mr. William, obituary of, 194

General Baptist Assembly Anniversary, 376. Gilchrist's Sermon before the, reviewed, 575

General Baptists, The, friendly to the Catholic Claims, 314

George II., when Prince of Wales, proposal to kidnap, 181

Germany, public affairs, &c., of, 132, 209, 342, 521, 587, 649

G. H. on the Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Association, 639

Gilchrist's Sermon before the Annual Assembly of General Baptists, reviewed, 575

G. K. on the Gainsborough Unitarian Association, 272, 638

Glasgow Chapel, case of, 516

GLEANINGS AND SELECTIONS, 107, 181, 256, 315, 373, 430, 560, 630

Gloucester, instance of bigotry at, 18

God, on the unity of, 9, 13, 148, 217—220, 283. Hymn to, 46, 577. On the grace of, 183. On the goodness of, 261. On degrading representations of, 436. Divine influence of, 545. Praise to, 577

Goodier, Rev. Benjamin, on the character of, 21. Memoir of, 69, 142

Graham, Mr. Thomas, his address on the death of Mr. G. W. Meadley, 5

Gray, Dr., his protest against Mr. Meadley's tablet, 282. Remarks on Dr. Gray's protest, 283

Greenock subscription, Mr. Belsham and Mr. Aspland on the, 30. Mr. Belsham on the, 125

Gregoire, the Abbé, account of, 207, 225, 648

G. S. on the General Baptists friendly to the Catholic Claims, 314

Gurney's Notes on Prisons, reviewed, 188

H.

Hack's, Maria, Grecian Stories, reviewed, 634

Hamilton, Mrs., her poem on Old Age, 117

HARRIS, Mr., his resolution of the Liverpool Fellowship Fund, 764

HARRISON, Mr., on Buonaparte's Unitarian project, 225. His statement of the general accounts of the Unitarian Chapel, Oldham, 585

Hawkes's Dissenter's Reasons for not observing Good-Friday and Christmas Day, reviewed, 576

Haydon v. Gould, case of, 177

Headcorn, opening of the Unitarian Baptist Chapel at, 515

Heathen Theism, on, 674

Hell torments, on the eternity of, 369

Hereulaneum MSS., Sir Humphry Davy's report of the state of the, 279

Hereford, state of religion at, 366

Hernhuters in Sweden, 542

H. G.'s obituary of Mr. William Gaskell, 194

High-Church Infidels, on, 308

HINCKS, Mr., on the copy of a certificate of marriage under the Commonwealth, 153. His addition to the list of writers in the Theological Repository, 532. On a resolution of the Exeter Fellowship Fund, 584

Hindoos, gross idolaters, 565

Hindoo Theism, a defence of, 566

Hindoo Unitarianism, reviewed, 561

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, 1, 69, 137, 213

History and present state of the law relating to marriage, 174

Hodgson on Stephen's Prayer, reviewed, 505

Holley, Mr., his popular preaching and liberal sentiments, 355

"Holy Alliance," Mr. Howe on the, 304

HOMO on morality of human characters, 226. On a future state, 293. On the character of Lady Russell, 617

Hornblower, Mr. Thomas, inscription on the tombstone of, 367

HOWE, Rev. T., on Buonaparte's Unitarian project, 31. On the Bridport Fellowship Fund, 154. On the persecution of the Jews of Lubeck, 231. On the "Holy Alliance," 304. On the Western Unitarian Society Anniversary, 453. On the Aged and Infirm Ministers' Society, 661. His obituary of Mr. Andrew Abbot, 706

H. T. on Unitarianism at New York, 459. On the Divine influence, 477

HUGHES, MRS. MARY, on the celebration of high mass in Edinburgh, 20. On the character of Rev. Benjamin Goodier, 21. On the Reformed Jews, 160. On a passage in Buchanan's "Researches," 288. On final restitution, 370

HUNTER, Mr., on Manuscript Memoirs, 31

Hutchinson and Wife v. Brookebanke, case of, 176

H. X. on Mr. J. Short's epitaph, 90

Hymn on Virtue, 46. To the Deity, ib. Children's Hymn, 118. Morning Hymn, 191. On Eternity, 577

I.	
I. K. on Heathen Theism,	674
I. L.'s lines on hearing Mr. * * * * * preach,	46
Illinois, extracts of letters from the, Improved Version, on the Rev. Samuel Newton's Objections to the, 402, 480, 534, 625. Reply to the charge of fraud preferred against the Editors of the,	689
Infants, on the baptism of, 32, 232,	608
Infidel, lines on an,	191
Infidel publications, formation of a society for the refutation of,	644
Ingram, Mr., sonnet to the memory of the late,	47
Inquiry into the principles and conduct of the Baptists respecting civil and religious liberty,	92
Inquisition, a modern victim of the,	91
Inspiration, remarks on,	412
Intellect, on the gradations of,	545
INTELLIGENCE, 48, 123, 196, 270, 330, 374, 446, 515, 578, 638, 707,	764
Intolerance of the Dissenters, usually denominated "Orthodox," as compared with that of the Established Churches, on the,	171
Irishman, extract from the,	587
Iron Coffins, on the right of burial in, 275,	583
Irregularities in public worship, on,	538
Irreligion and blasphemy, Sir F. Burdett's remarks on,	714
Ishopanishad, Translation of the,	565
Italy, literature, &c. of, 209, 279,	343
I. W. on a letter on the dread of Unitarianism,	101
J	
J.'s account of the opening of the Unitarian Baptist Chapel at Headcorn,	515
Jackson, Mrs., obituary of,	514
James II. and Charles II., anecdotes of, from Evelyn,	156
JAMES, Mr., on the Welsh Unitarian Ministers' Quarterly Meeting, 339, 764. On the Welsh Unitarian Society Anniversary,	454
JANSON's, Mr., extracts of letters from the Illinois,	689
J. B. on an extract from Llorente's History of the Inquisition, 91. On Constant's characters of Fox and Pitt, 538. His character of Mr. Bretland, 559. His account of the Sheffield Controversy, 585. On the state of religion in Spain, in 1819, 589. On the ecclesiastical constitution for South America,	710
J. C. on the certificate of a marriage	
in 1653, 291. His remarks on inspiration,	412
Jenkins, Rev. Joseph, D. D., obituary of,	120
Jesus made both Lord and Christ, passage on,	182
Jesus Christ, Fullagar on the worship of, reviewed, 190. Reflections upon his character, 260. On the pre-existence of, 284. On salvation by the merits of, 328. On the resurrection of, 438. Thoughts on the Scripture doctrine of the judgment of the world by, 497. Faith of the Transatlantic Unitarians with respect to the person of, 635. On John Baptist's message to,	671
JEVANS, Mr., on the doctrine of atonement,	550
Jewish Expositor, extract from the, Jews' embassy to Cromwell, inquiry respecting the,	231
Jews in Germany, brutal persecution against the, 231,	587
Jews, preaching <i>at</i> and not <i>to</i> ,	315
Jews, right of to share in Christian charities,	578
Jews, Spanish, sketch of the history and literature of the,	345
J. F. on the prosecution of Carlile,	727
J. H. B. on the Dudley Double Lecture Anniversary,	516
J. J.'s inquiry respecting Onesiphorus, 90. On the Quarterly Meeting of Welsh Unitarian Ministers, 127,	764
J. J. T.'s obituary of Mr. John Wellbeloved,	704
J. N.'s obituary of Mrs. Sarah Wilson,	445
Job, account of Bridel's new Translation of the Book of,	423
J. O. H. on the best plans of chancery,	545
John i. 1, suggestion on, 41, 42, 116, 246; viii. 58, observations on, 433; xii. 31, 32, criticism on, 109; xii. 34, remark on, 317; xvii. 3, remarks on, 434; xx. 28, criticism on,	413
I John v. 7, on the omission of, in a Latin Version of the New Testament,	599
Johnson, Dr., on his character of Gilbert West, 226,	412
JONES's, Dr. JOHN, remarks on the parable of the unjust steward, Luke xvi. 1,	660
J. O. U. on suicides and capital punishments,	475
J. P. S. on Calvin's notion of the Sabbath,	488
J. S.'s obituary of Mrs. Bennett,	194
J. T.'s suggestion on John i. 1, 41. On a passage in the Essex-Street Psalms,	532

Justin Martyr, doctrine and authority of, 431
J. W.'s obituary of Rev. Josiah Townsend, 512. His extract from a sermon on divine influence, 622. His observations on Stephen's prayer, 729

K.

KAESTNER on an infidel, 191
 Kenrick, Mrs. Marianne, obituary of, 65
 Kenrick, Mrs., obituary of, 66, 120
 Kenrick's Scriptural Meaning of the title Son of God, reviewed, 573
 Kent and Sussex Unitarian Association Anniversary, 449. Report of the Committee, 450
 Kentish, Rev. J., extract from his discourse on the death of Mrs. Kenrick, 120. On the Rev. Joseph Bretland's publications, &c., 473
 Kentucky, state of religion in, 242, 763
 Kidderminster, history of late disturbances at, 354
 Kingsford, Mr. Sampson, his address on laying the first stone of the new Unitarian General Baptist Chapel at Dover, 337

L.

Labourers in the vineyard, observations on the parable of the, 315
 Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Association, 639
 Lancaster, Joseph, extracts from a letter of his to Mr. Sharwood, 397
 Law of executors regarding Unitarians, 159
 Layman's Letter to the Rev. Samuel Newton, reviewed, 265
 L. B.'s review of The Essentials of a National Church briefly explained, &c., 435
 Legal reforms, on, 584
 Leishman, Mr. William, obituary of, 510
 Letter on the dread of Unitarianism, 101
 Letter to the Protestant, reviewed, 441
 Lewis v. Hammond, case of, 58
 Lexington, on the Unitarian congregation at, 81, 242
 Licentious conversation, on, 325
 Life, lines on, 47
 LIGNARIUS on the charge of Unitarianism against Thomas May, 465
 Limborth, Philip à, his letters to John Locke, 9, 12, 146, 147, 217, 219, 220
 Lincoln, history of the Presbyterian congregation in, 213
 Lines by an African woman, 191
 Lines written, but not sent, to Dr. Priestley, on his address to the Jews, 46

Literary anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century, extract from, 639
 LITERARY INTELLIGENCE, 62, 130, 206, 276, 341, 397, 648
 Literature, on the cause of nonconformity as connected with, 24
 Little minds, 560
 Little's Sermon on Death and a Future Life, reviewed, 509
 Liverpool Fellowship Fund, resolution of the, 764
 Liverpool, new congregation of Unitarians in, 127
 L. J. J. on the divine influence, 367, 675
 Lloyd, Rev. Richard, Fullagar's Letter to, reviewed, 508
 Locke, John, his letters to Philip à Limborth, 10, 147, 218
 Locke and Newton Anti-Trinitarians, 19
 Lord's day not the Sabbath, 424, 553
 Lord's Prayer, remarks on the, 437
 Lord's Supper, on the ordinance of the, 172
 Louis XIV., character of, 108
 Lovell, Mr. Daniel, obituary of, 65
 Lubeck, on the prosecution of the Jews of, 231
 LUCKCOCK, Mr., on the new sect of abstainers from animal food, 312. On some late public proceedings, 558, 686. On a proposed monument to Mr. Raikes, 685
 Luke xvi 1, remarks on, 660; xx. 41, passage on, 574
 Lutheranism in Sweden, 541

M.

M.'s obituary of Mr. Walter Miller, 268. His review of A letter to the Protestant, 441. Of Hodgson on Stephen's Prayer, 505
 Macaulay's England, extract from, 525
 Mackintosh, Sir James, his speech before the Protestant Society, 391
 Madge, Mr., reply to, on final restitution, 86
 Magee, Dr., remarks on his arguments to prove the passover to be a sacrifice, 468
 MALCOM, Mr., his letter to Rev. R. Wardlaw, on his Discourses, entitled "The Socinian Controversy," 420
 Man, religious view of the total mortality of, 362
 Manchester College, York, Notices, 341, 397. Account of the annual examination at, 447. Annual meeting of trustees of, 712
 Manchester Presbyterian Quarterly Meeting, &c., 60, 270
 Manley, Mrs. Jane, obituary of, 705
 MANNING, Mr., on John Baptist's message to Jesus, 671

Manuscript Memoirs, on, 31
 MARDON, Mr., on a memoir of the Rev. Joseph Bretland, 494. His case of Glasgow Chapel, 516. His Sermon before the Association of Scottish Unitarian Christians, reviewed, 636
 Mardon, Mr. William, obituary of, 514
 Mark xiii. 32, remarks on, 435
 Markland on the text of Scripture, 630
 Marriage ceremony, questions on the, 159. Protests against the, 179, 272, 340
 Marriage, history and present state of the law relating to, 174
 Marriage laws, petition on the, 125, 198, 382 Proceedings in Parliament on the subject of the, 383, 446
 Marriage protests, F. K. on, 303
 MARSON, Mr., his remarks on Dr. Magee's arguments to prove the passover to be a sacrifice, 468
 MARTEN, Mr., his account of the laying the first stone of the new Unitarian General Baptist Chapel at Dover, 337. On Unitarian Pado-baptism, 490
 Matriculation at the Universities, on, 287
 Matt. xi. 2, note on, 544; xix. 26, remarks on, 725; xix. 30, xx. 1—17, observations on, 315; xxv. interpretation of, 534; xxvii. 46, on, 475
 MAXON, Mr., on Cappe's Memoirs, 408
 May, Thomas, on the charge of Unitarianism, against, 465
 Mayhew, Dr. Jonathan, character of, 296. On his sermons, 663
 M'Dermott, Lieut. Henry, obituary of, 399
 Meadley, Mr. G. W., tribute to the memory of, 5. His account of the society of Unitarian Christians in Sunderland, (*note*,) *ib.* Addition to the memoir of, 121. V. F.'s memoir of, 137. Proceedings at Sunderland relating to his monument, 281. V. M. H. on the biographical notices of, 465
 Medal of the Reformation, 457
 Members of parliament receiving the sacrament, on, 724
 Memoirs. See HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.
 Memoir of John James Wetstein, 248
 Methodist declaration of loyalty, 767
 Methodists in Ireland, case decided between the, 127
 Methodist Unitarians at Newchurch, &c., annual association of, 516
 Miller, Mr. Walter, obituary of, 268
 Millin, Chevalier, obituary of, 269
 Milton's Prose Works, by Symmons, extract from, (*note*,) 25
 MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICA-

TIONS, 13, 77, 149, 221, 281, 345, 401, 461, 525
 MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE, 63, 129, 200, 273, 456, 518, 585, 641, 713, 767
 Mission of the Syrian Archbishop, 201
 M. N.'s remarks on the criticisms on John i. 1, 246. On future rewards and punishments, 369. On Pagan and Christian Trinities, 540
 Molineux, Rev. Mr., and Mr. H. Gaskell, correspondence between, 286
 Monks and friars of Spain, description of the, (*note*,) 589
 Monthly Review, extract from, on the Abbé Morellet's *Miscellanées*, 31
 Moore's Full Inquiry into Suicide, ode from, 636
 MOORE, Mr., on the Wesleyan Penny-a-Week Societies, &c., 297. On the form of registering places of public worship, 299
 Moore's, (Thomas, Esq.,) lines for the monument of Joseph Atkinson, Esq., 118
 Morality of human characters, on, 226
 MORELL, Dr., on the state of the Unitarian Chapel, Brighton, 638
 Morning hymn, 191

N.
 N.'s review of *Wellbeloved on Conversion*, 184. His observations on the parable of the labourers in the vineyard, 315. His review of Kenrick's *Scriptural Meaning of the Title Son of God*, 573
 Napoléon, Saint, 315
 Nazarenes, their belief, 431
 Nedham, Mr. John, epitaph on, 419
 Neesom, Rev. William, his deprivation by the Archbishop of York, 584
 Newcastle-under-Line, state of the old Presbyterian Chapel at, 732
 NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE, 67, 135, 212, 280, 400, 460, 524, 588, 652
 Newton and Locke Anti-Trinitarians, 19
 Newton, Rev. Samuel, on his objections to the Improved Version, 401, 480, 534, 625
 Nicene-Creed, strictures on the, 435
 NICOLETTI, Mr., on the "Poetical Epistle to Dr. Priestley," 491
 N. L. T. on Dr. Mayhew's Sermons, 663
 NONCONFORMIST, THE, 24, 92, 171, 248, 308, 345, 426, 461, 525, 602, 689, 735
 Nonconformity of the early Christians, 308
 North Eastern Unitarian Association Anniversary, 449
 Norwich Mercury, extract from the, 445

Notes and Observations on Criminal Trials, reviewed, 509
NOTICES, 65, 135, 211, 273, 277, 341,
 November, ode on the progress of, Nowah on the assault of the fort of, 559, 616, 686,
 Nunn, Mr. George, obituary of, 734
 514

O.

OATH-OPPOSER, An, on commercial oaths, 491
OBITUARY, 65, 119, 192, 268, 398, 445, 510, 650,
OCCASIONAL LAY PREACHER, An, on legal protection of preachers, 704
OCCASIONAL READER, An, on final restitution, 82,
 Ogilvie, Professor, obituary of, 293
 Old Age, a poem, by the late Mrs. Hamilton, 120
 Old Testament, silence of the, on future life, 364
 Oldham Unitarian Chapel, statement of the general accounts of the, 585
OLEARIUS on freedom, 191
ONE OF A HUNDRED, case of, 80
ONE on the law of executors regarding Unitarians, 159
 Onesiphorus, inquiry respecting, 90
 Opinions, on the prevailing diversity of, 101
 Ordination, certificate of, in the year 1649, 153
OTIOSUS on Roman Catholic estimates of Unitarian arguments, 533. His inquiry respecting a passage in Tomasini de Tesseris Hospitalitatis, 601
 Outrage at Edinburgh, 21, 63
 Owen's, Mr., plan for providing for the poor, 641

P

Pagan and Christian Trinities, on, 540
 Paris, Curran's visit to the catacombs at, 430. Prize questions at the Royal Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres at, 274
 Parish Clerks' Bill, on the, 648
PARKINSON, Mr., on the Loughborough and Mountsorrel Fellowship Fund, 275
PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE, 202, 456
 Passover, on the word, 275
 Paul's, St. Epistles, on the authenticity of, 479. A new Version of, reviewed, 569, 631, 693, 576
 Peirce's Vindication, extract from, 758
 Persecuted French Protestants, ad- dress of the committee for the relief of the, 374
 Peterborough, obituary of the Bishop of, 636
 Peters, Hugh, essay on the life and character of, 525, 602
PHILAETHES on prophecy fulfilled in passing events, 226. On the prophetic numbers, 372. On the authenticity of St. Paul's Epistles, 479. His new Version of the Epistles of St. Paul, reviewed, 569, 631, 693, 758. On Stephen's prayer, 729
 Philipp. ii. 12, 13, lecture on, 546
PHILIPPS, Dr., on the review of his Sermon before the Unitarian Fund, 40, 362
 Pious frauds, on, 752
 Pitt and Fox, characters of, 538
 Playfair, Professor, death of, 513
POETICUS on Johnson's character of West, 117
POETRY, 46, 117, 190, 442, 577, 636
 Poland, population of, 133
 Poor, Mr. Owen's plan for providing for the, 641
 Population of the globe, 275
 Praise to God, lines on, 577
 Preachers, on legal protection of, 405
 Preaching *at* and not *to* Jews, 315
 Presbyterian congregation in Lincoln, history of the, 213
 Presbyterian congregations, Mr. Cor- nish on the decline of, 77
 Prevost, J. Benedict, obituary of, 650
 Price, Mr. Samuel, Jun., obituary of 651
 Priestley's (Dr.) Theological and Miscellaneous Works, reviewed, 321
 Priestley, Dr., lines written, but not sent to, on his Address to the Jews, 46. Poetical epistle addressed to, 422, 491
 Priests in the thirteenth century, real heresies of, 107
 Prisons, Gurney's Notes on, re- viewed, 188
 Prophecy fulfilled in passing events, 226
 Prophetic numbers, on the, 288, 372
 Proposal to kidnap George II. when Prince of Wales, 181
 Prosecutions for blasphemy, 129, 645
 Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty, anniversary of the, 330, 388
 Protests against the marriage cere- mony, 179, 272, 340
 Prov. iii. 6, extract from a sermon on, 622
 Prussia, public affairs, &c. of, 133, 342, 521
 Public worship, on irregularities in, 539
 Punishment of Death in the Case of Forgery, reviewed, 267

Q.

Q. on an outrage at Edinburgh, 21
Quaker-marriages, form of, 360
Quakers' "Minutes," Dr. Walker on the, 88
Quakers' Yearly Epistle, 1819, 517
Questions on the marriage ceremony, 159

R.

R. on the cause of nonconformity as connected with the interests of general literature, 24. His obituary of Mr. James Rait, 268
Raffles' Tour on the Continent, extract from, 225
Raikes, Mr., on a proposed monument to, 685
Rait, Mr. James, obituary of, 268
Raleigh's, Sir Walter, History of the World, extract from, 630
Rammohun Roy's Translation of an Abridgment of the Vedant, &c., reviewed, 561. Prefatory address, 562
Rammohun Roy, life of, 561
R. B. on the late seceders from the Church, 21
R. D. on the baptismal commission, 599
READ, Mr., on Anabaptism in the Church of England, 406. On an article in the British Critic, on Unitarianism at Geneva, 666
Real heresies of priests in the thirteenth century, 107
Reason, sonnet to, 190
Recovering the dead, Evelyn's case of, 373
Rees, D. J., on the obituary of, 103
Rees, Dr. T., his Sermon to Young Persons, reviewed, 509
REES's, Dr. T., account of a correspondence with William Roberts, and the native Unitarian Christians at Madras, 688
Reeve's Sermons, extract from, 630
Reflections on the Blacks and Whites, reviewed, 329
Reformed Jews, on the, 160, 371
Reformer, Mr. Evelyn a, 229
REGISTER OF ECCLESIASTICAL DOCUMENTS, 122
Religion, on the use of reason in, 182. On the influence of, in seasons of joy and grief, 323. On the instrumental duties of, 326
RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE, 48, 123, 196, 270, 330, 374, 446, 515, 584, 638, 707, 764
Religious knowledge, on the value of, 324
Religious Liberty and the Rights of Conscience and Private Judgment grossly violated, &c., reviewed, 266. On the dedication of to Mr. Belsham, 300

Religious liberty, on the sentiments of the early Continental Reformers respecting, 680, 735
Religious view of the total mortality of man, 363
Remarks concerning the present state of religious sects in Sweden, 541
Rev. xiv. 11, remarks on, 499
Rev. xxii. 8, 9, criticism on, 434
Revelation, on the contents of the book of the, 42, 113, 317, 416, 677
REVIEW, 182, 257, 321, 431, 496, 561, 631, 693, 752
R. F.'s sonnet to Sir Samuel Romilly, 47. His sonnet to the memory of the late Mr. Ingram, *ib.* His history of late disturbances at Kidderminster, 354. On praise to God, 577
R. H. on the division of the Decalogue by Catholics, 299
Right of Appeal, 200
Right of Protestant Dissenters, extracts from, (*note,*) 427, 428
Roberts, William, of Madras, account of a correspondence with, 688
Robinson, Rev. R., on Mr. Belsham's censure of, 32, 232, 608. Extracts from his History of the German Baptists, 95
Rom. ix. 5, remarks on, 432
Roman Catholic estimates of Unitarian arguments, 533
Romilly, Sir Samuel, conclusion of a sermon on the death of, 13. Sonnet to, 47. Mr. Rutt on, 106. Constant's Eulogium on, reviewed, 263. Belsham's Reflections upon the Death of, reviewed, 264. Worsley's Sermon on the Death of, reviewed, 265. Mr. Fullgar on, 410
Romish Index, 767
Ronalds, Mr. Silvanus, obituary of, 268
Royal births, 273
Royal Humane Society, establishment of the, 2
Rozzill, Mr. Charles, his epitaph on Mr. John Nedham, 419
R. S. on the sentiments of the early Continental Reformers respecting religious liberty, 680, 735
R. T. on High Church Infidels, 308
Russell, Lord John, a Letter to, on the Necessity of Parliamentary Reform, reviewed, 703
Russell, Lady, character of, 617
Russell, Mr., at Hyderabad, extract from his letter, 559. On, 616, 686, 734
Russell, the parodist, sentence on, 715
RUTT, Mr., on Locke and Limboreh's Correspondence, 9. His additions and corrections to the memoir of Dr. Cogan, &c., 105. His edition of Dr. Priestley's Works, reviewed, 321. His notice of Dr. Priestley's

Works, 341. On the Commonwealth Marriage Act, 357. On defensive war, 409, 725. On Voltaire's representation of the Divine paternity, 483. On Anabaptism in the Church of England, 721. On Anthony Collins's and Sir Thomas Abney's conformity, 723. On members of parliament receiving the sacrament, 724. On Sir H. Moncrieff Wellwood's Life of Dr. John Erskine, 725

S.

S. and K.'s history of the Presbyterian congregation in Lincoln, 213
Sabbath, Calvin's notion of the, 424, 488, 553,
Saint, Mr. William, obituary of, 445. Tribute to the memory of, 493
Saint Napoléon, 315
Salter's Hall Synod, 1719, voters in the, 16
Satisfaction, dissertation on the doctrine of, 502
Saxton, Miss Sarah, obituary of, 195
School for Scriptural Christians, on, 39
Scotch Unitarian Association, report of the, 339. Mardon's Sermon before the, reviewed, 636
Scripture, botanical elucidations of, 607
Scripture, Mr. B. Flower on Dr. Walker's treatment of, 162
SEWARD, Mr., on a poetical epistle to Dr. Priestley, 422
SENEX on the removal of commercial oaths, 670
Sermons, chiefly on Practical Subjects, by E. Cogan, reviewed, 257, 323
Severn, Mrs., obituary of, 194
Sharwood, Mr., extracts from Joseph Lancaster's letter to, 397
Sheffield controversy, account of the, 585
Sheffield Fellowship Fund, resolution of the, 641
Sherer's, Rev. Joseph Godfrey, Discourse on Excommunication, reviewed, 441
Short, Mr. J., remarks on his epitaph, 90
Sidmouth, (Viscount,) Hon. H. G. Bennet's Letter to, on the Transportation Laws, &c., reviewed, 245
SILVER, Mr., on schools for all, 202
Sixteen Missionary Discourses, by Richard Wright; reviewed, 182
Slaves in the West India Islands, motion respecting the, 202
Smith, Dr. T. Southwood, his conclusion of a sermon on the death of Sir Samuel Romilly, 13. His Sermon before the Western Unitarian Society, reviewed, 509
Smith, Robert, Esq., obituary of, 192
Smith, Sir J. E., notice of his two pamphlets, 586. His botanical elucidations of Scripture, 607. His account of the late Dr. Tennant, 608
Smyrna, particulars of a recent martyrdom at, 649
Socinianism in Sweden, 542
Soldiers and butchers, 560
Solly, Miss Elizabeth Cogan's Sermon on the Death of, reviewed, 442
Solly, Mrs. Elizabeth, obituary of, 398
Somerset and Dorset Half yearly meeting of ministers, 396, 639
Sonnet to Sir Samuel Romilly, 47. To Mr. Ingram, *ib*. From "Apeleutherus," *ib*. To Reason, 190. To Benevolence, *ib*. On court sycophants, 637
Son of God, remarks on the title, 574
South America, public affairs, &c., of, 134, 343, 459, 650. On the ecclesiastical constitution for, 719
South Carolina, late religious proceedings at Charleston, in, 241
Southern Unitarian Book Society, Bennett's Sermon before the, reviewed, 266
Southern Unitarian Fund Society Anniversary, 271
Southern Unitarian Society, Fullagar's Sermon before the, reviewed, 190. Its anniversary, 452. Evans's Sermon before the, reviewed, 635
S. P. on the inscription on the tombstone of Mr. Thomas Hornblower, 367. His essay on the life and character of Hugh Peters, 525, 602. His State of the Old Presbyterian Chapel at Newcastle-under-Line, 732
Spain, public affairs, &c., of, 133, 209, 457, 649. On the state of religion in, in 1819, 589. Establishment of the British system of education in, 649
Spanish Jews, sketch of the history and literature of the, 345
S. S. on the Somerset and Dorset Half-yearly meeting of ministers, 396, 639
Stansfeld, Mr. Josias, obituary of, 66
State Letters, remarkable passage in the, 525
St. Domingo, public affairs, &c., of, 135, 211
Stephen's prayer, observations on, 505, 728, 729
Stewart's, Professor, Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind, extract from, (note,), 642
Stodhart, Rev. R., bigotry of, 56. On the, 164, 165
Strype's Whitgift, extract from, (note,) 27. His Life of Aylmer, extract from, 557

Suicides and capital punishments, on, 475
 Sussex Unitarian Association, establishment of the, 640
 Sweden, population of, 133. Remarks concerning the present state of religious sects in, 541. On the universities of, 649
 S—y on the Southern Unitarian Fund Society anniversary, 271
 Syrian Archbishop, mission of the, 201

T.

T. on the intolerance of the Dissenters, usually denominated "Orthodox," as compared with that of the Established Churches, 171. On a General Unitarian Association, 672
 Taunton Fellowship Fund, formation of the, 584
 TAYLOR, Mr. H., on the Unitarian congregation at Lexington, 242
 T. C., Jun. on the Southern Unitarian Society Anniversary, 452
 T. C. H.'s account of early Unitarian Christian writers, 306. On the union of the Burghers and Anti-burghers, 366. His review of Wellwood's Life of Dr. John Erskine, 439. On the interpretation of Matt. xxv., 534
 T. D.'s list of ministers of the Presbyterian congregation at Coventry, 600
 Temple's Letters to Randolph, note in, 729
 Tennant, Dr., Sir J. E. Smith's account of, 608
 Test and Corporation Acts, on the, 426
 T. F. on the divine influence, 476
 T. G.'s report of the Scotch Unitarian Association, 339
 Theological Repository, writers in the, 532
 Thomas, Mr. Thomas, on the obituary of, 103
 Thompson's, Dr., monument, inquiry respecting, 652. Reply, 692
 Thoughts on a country life, 668
 Thoughts on Suicide, reviewed, 702
 Titford, Mrs. Nancy, obituary of, 195
 T. J.'s obituary of the Rev. Joseph Bretland, 445
 Toleration obsolete, 256
 Tomasini de Tesseris Hospitalitatis, inquiry respecting a passage in, 601
 Tomkins, Rev. Martin, some account of, 653
 Toulmin, Mr., and the Unitarian congregation at Lexington, 81, 242
 Townend, Mr. George, obituary of, 510
 TOWNSEND, Mr., on John xii. 34, 317
 Townsend, Rev. Josiah, obituary of, 512. His letter containing some account of his father, 717
 Townsend, Rev. Meredith, some account of, 717

T. P. on the Kent and Sussex Unitarian Association Anniversary, 449
 T. R.'s obituary of Rev. William Williams, 510
 Tribute to the memory of the late Mr. G. W. Meadley, 5
 Trinitarian's Appeal Answered, The, reviewed, 265
 Trinity, extract from a letter on the, 352
 T. T. on the contents of the book of the Revelation, 42, 113, 317, 416, 677
 Turkey, public affairs, &c. of, 133, 649
 Turner's History of the Anglo-Saxons, passage from, 576
 Twelve tribes, account of the crimes and punishments of the, (note,) 594
 Twentieth article of the Church of England, on the controverted clause in the, 461
 T. W. H. on the Sussex Unitarian Association, 640
 Tyerman's Essays, on a passage in, 425

U.

U. B.'s history and present state of the law relating to marriage, 174
 Unitarian Association, formation of the, 48. Its proposed regulations, 50. Its petition on the subject of the marriage laws, 125, 198, 382. Annual general meeting, 377. Report of the Committee, *ib.* Congregations united to the Association, 380, 447. Proceedings in Parliament on the subject of the marriage laws, 383, 446. On a General Association, 672

UNITARIAN ASSOCIATIONS, SOCIETIES, &c., anniversary meetings of, 199, 271, 330, 337, 339, 376, 377, 386, 394, 396, 397, 447, 449, 452, 453, 454, 516, 712
 UNITARIAN, A STEADY, on a letter on the Trinity, 352
 UNITARIAN, A ZEALOUS, on irregularities in public worship, 539
 Unitarian Baptist Chapel at Headcorn, opening of the, 515
 Unitarian Chapel, Brighton, the, appeal in behalf of, 127. State of, 638
 Unitarian Chapel, Flushing, opening of the, 338
 Unitarian Chapel, Oldham, statement of the general accounts of the, 585
 Unitarian Christian truth, anticipation of the final success and universal prevalence of, 504
 Unitarian Fund, Dr. Philpotts on the review of his Sermon before the, 40, 362
 Unitarian Fund, Report of the, 1818, 60, 123, 196. Mr. Wright on the, 227. Its anniversary, 394. Mr. Yates's Sermon before the, reviewed, 762

INDEX.

Unitarian General Baptist Chapel, Dover, ceremony of laying the first stone of the, 337

Unitarian Hymn-Books, on the composition of, 466

Unitarianism at Geneva, on an article in the British Critic on, 666

Unitarianism in America, 458, 459, 522

Unitarianism, letter on the dread of, 101

Unitarian ministers, appointments and removals of, 273, 456

UNITARIAN OF THE OLD SCHOOL, AN, on the extinction of Arianism, 721

Unitarian Pædobaptism, 433, 490

Unitarians, the, Law of executors regarding, 150. On Mr. Stodhart's anathemas against, 164, 165. Correspondence in the *Times* Newspaper relating to the, 707. Separation of the private opinions, of, from Unitarianism, 755

Unitarian Society, the, Mr. Belsham on the original principle of, 657. William Roberts's letter to the secretary of, 688. Mr. Frend on the origin of, 743

United States of America, public affairs, &c., of, 134, 210, 278, 343, 397, 458, 522

Universal restitution, on the doctrine of, 87

Unjust steward, remarks on the parable of the, 660

Upanishad, Translation of the, 564

V.

VALENTINE, Mr., on Mr. Toulmin and the Unitarian congregation at Lexington, 81

Vasteys, Baron de, his Reflections on the Blacks and Whites, reviewed, 329

VERCTIS on a passage in Tyeaman's Essays, 425

Vedant, Translation of an Abridgement of the, reviewed, 561

Venice, an Ode by Lord Byron, 442

VERBUM SAT on Unitarian Pædobaptism, 413

V. F. on the tribute to the memory of the late Mr. G. W. Meadley, 5. His memoir of Mr. Meadley, 137. His account of the proceedings at Sunderland relating to Mr. Meadley's monument, 281

VIGILIUS POSTHUMUS on John xii. 31, 32, 109

Vineyard, observations on the parable of the labourers in the, 315

Violet, lines to a, 191

Virtue, hymn on, 46

Vitality, medical dispute on the origin of, 623. Correct statement of, 750

V. M. H. on the biographical notices of Mr. G. W. Meadley, 465

Voltaire's representation of the Divine paternity, 483

Voters in the Salters' Hall Synod, in 1719, 16. Corrections in the list of, 106

V. V.'s obituary of Messrs. John and Thomas Carpenter, 399

W.

W. on the form of Quaker-marriages, 360

Wakefield, Mrs., obituary of, 120

WALKER, DR. JOHN, on the Quakers' "Minutes," 88

Walker's, Dr., treatment of Scripture, Mr. B. Flower on, 162

Walker, Dr. and the Quakers, on, 366

Walker, Thomas, Esq., obituary of, 120

Walton, Mr. William, obituary of, 651

War, description of, 756

Wardlaw, Rev. R., letter to, on his Discourses, entitled "The Socinian Controversy," 420

Warwick Unitarian Chapel, time of service, &c., 479

Wellbeloved on Conversion, reviewed, 184. Mrs. Cappe on, 291

WELLBELOVED, MR., on his "New Edition of the Bible," 341

Wellbeloved, Mr. John, obituary of, 652, 704

Wellwood's, Sir Henry Moncrieff, Life of Dr. John Erskine, reviewed, 439

Welsh Unitarian Ministers' Quarterly Meeting, 127, 339, 764

Welsh Unitarian Society anniversary, 454

Wesleian Penny-a-Week Societies, on the, 297

Western Unitarian Society, 396. Its anniversary, 453. Dr. T. Southwood Smith's Sermon before the, reviewed, 509. Dr. Carpenter on proceedings in the, 744

West, Gilbert, Dr. Johnson's character of, 226, 412

Wetstein, John James, memoir of, 248

W. H.'s religious view of the total mortality of man, 362

Whittred, William, Esq., obituary of, 268

Wigmore's case, 177

Wilks, Mr., his speech before the Protestant Society, 330, 388

Williams's, Helen Maria, Letters on France, reviewed, 699

Williams, Rev. William, obituary of, 510

Wilson, Mrs. Sarah, obituary of, 445

WILTSHIRE FREEHOLDER, A, on the late Wiltshire election, 519

W. J. on the Manchester Presbyterian Quarterly Meeting, &c., 60, 270

W. J. C.'s children's hymn, 118

W. J. T.'s obituary of Mrs. Nancy Titford, 195

INDEX.

783

Wolcot, Dr. John, obituary of,	66	W. W. on a medical dispute on the origin of vitality,	623. His account of the Rev. Martin Tomkins,
Woman, lines on,	577	653. His letter from the Rev. Josiah Townsend,	717
Wood-street, Spitalfields, Charity School, late proceedings in the,	56.		
On the,	164,		
Worsley's Sermon on the Death of Sir Samuel Romilly, reviewed,	265		
WRIGHT, Mr. R., his journal of his mission in Scotland in 1817,	60,		
123, 196. His Missionary Discourses reviewed, 182. On the Unitarian Fund, 227. His Essay on Election and Reprobation, &c., reviewed, 328. Extract from his Free Grace of God defended,	552.		
His Essay on a Future Life, reviewed, 575. His case of the New Unitarian Chapel at Boston,	687.		
On the Difference between Unitarians and Deists, reviewed,	702		
Wright's, John, American Unitarian Controversy, reviewed, 703. Charge of his having relinquished the Unitarian Cause refuted,	767		
W. T. P.'s obituary of Mrs. Jackson,	514		
		X.	
X. on the silence of the Old Testament on future life,			364
		Y.	
Yates, Mrs., obituary of,	66,		119
Yates's Sermon before the Unitarian Fund, reviewed,			762
York, deprivation of a clergyman by the Archbishop of,			584
		Z.	
Z.'s reply to Mr. Madge, on final re-stitution, 86. His thoughts on a country life,			668



TABLE OF TEXTS

EXPLAINED OR ILLUSTRATED.

1 SAMUEL	xx.	12,	-	-	414
2 Samuel	xxiv.	23,	-	-	42, 247
MATTHEW	xi.	2,	-	-	544
	xii.	50,	-	-	42
	xix.	26,	-	-	725
	xix.	30,	-	-	315
	xx.	1—17,	-	-	<i>ib.</i>
	xxv.	40,	-	-	534
Mark.	xxvii.	46,	-	-	475
John	xiii.	32,	-	-	435
	i.	1,	-	-	41, 42, 116, 246
	v.	22—27,	-	-	320
	viii.	50,	-	-	284
	viii.	58,	-	-	433
	x.	30,	-	-	283
	xii.	31, 32,	-	-	109
	xii.	34,	-	-	317
	xvii.	3,	-	-	434
	xvii.	5, 22, 24,	-	-	501
	xx.	28,	-	-	413
Acts	ii.	36,	-	-	182
Romans	ix.	5,	-	-	432
1 Corinthians	v.	7,	-	-	468
Revelation	xi.	7, 15—17	-	-	226
	xiv.	6, 9,	-	-	<i>ib.</i>
	xiv.	11,	-	-	499
	xv.	3, 4	-	-	226

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Messrs. Cogan; W. B. Kennaway; Edward Taylor; and Mrs. Cappe; and from An Enquirer; A Constant Reader; Vectis; S. W.; Brevior; H. T.; An Unitarian Christian; An Occasional Reader; Amicus; and E. S.—Of these some were designed by the writers for the present Number, but arrived too late; as is also the case with G. D. on Baptism, which the remonstrances of some of our Subscribers will prevent our carrying into another Volume.

The next Number, the first of Volume FIFTEEN, will contain a *Memoir of RAMONIN ROY*, translated from the French, published by the Abbé Gregoire.

We had prepared for the present Number a Review of *Dr. Lindsey's Sermons*, but this, with other articles of Review, is excluded by some of the preceding communications of immediate interest.

Our printer has provided a new and handsome *type* for the succeeding Volume, so that in *appearance*, and we hope also in reality, the Monthly Repository will hereafter be more worthy of the public eye.

* * * The Publishers have one or two complete Sets of the Monthly Repository in Fourteen Volumes, which may be had at the original price, exclusive of the binding.

ERRATA.

Page 634, col. 1, line 15 from the bottom, after "it," read *is*.

Page 693, col. 2, line 9 from the bottom, before the quotation add the figure 12.

Page 698, col. 2, line 15 from the bottom, for "δορημα" read δωρημα.

y;
r;
r;
nt
he
er

M-
ut
a-
so
er
in

places the wisdom of heaven in so conspicuous a light as the manner in which Paul was called to his high office as apostle of the Gentiles. The Anti-christian teachers endeavoured to undermine the gospel by maintaining, that the Christ who appeared after death was not the same with him who had been put to death. If this position were well-founded, the return of Jesus to raise the dead and judge the world, would fall to the ground. The divine power promised to the disciples was deferred till Jesus had ascended to heaven, in order that its communication from thence might be considered as a conclusive proof of his actual ascension, and a pledge of his return at some future period to confer a new life on mankind. The conversion of Paul in the manner it was effected, had in view the more complete establishment of the same great object. If Jesus some years after he had left the earth appeared to one that was an enemy—if, appearing amidst his celestial glory, he convinced that enemy that he was the very Jesus of Nazareth whom he was persecuting—if he next enlisted him within the same service with those whom he had already chosen, imparting to him precisely the same doctrine, inspiring him with the same spirit of meekness, patience and devotion in the cause of his divine Master—finally, if he endowed him with the same power of working miracles, and that without any communication with the rest of the apostles, and even without their knowledge:—if Jesus did all these things, he gave to Paul, to all his followers, and to the whole world, an everlasting proof that the Saviour was still alive, dwelling in inaccessible light with his heavenly Father, and that one day, however distant, he would in the power of his Father descend to consummate the grand events promised in the gospel. This scheme of Divine Providence required that Paul should hold no intercourse with the other apostles until he was converted, until his credentials were fully ratified from above, independently of them. In pursuance of this purpose, Divine Wisdom made use of his misguided zeal to remove him from Jerusalem: and Jesus deferred appearing to him, till he was too far on the road to return. Being near Damascus, he was led to that city, where he was to receive his commission, and to commence his arduous undertaking as an apostle of Christ.”—Pp. 183—185.

Gamaliel Smith has seized with great acuteness some of the discrepancies between the several relations of the same circumstances in Paul's history in various parts of the Acts

and the Epistles. These Ben David attempts to explain, sometimes successfully, but at other times rather ingeniously than satisfactorily: e. g.

“—the historian asserts that, while the companions of Saul, though they saw no one, did hear the voice, *Acts ix. 7*; while Paul in his apology, *xxii. 9*, represents them as having seen the light, without having heard the voice. Here it must be remembered that the mode in which the apostle had stated the event, was afterwards penned by Luke, as well as his own: and it is utterly incredible that he should have recorded two statements apparently so inconsistent, and so likely to furnish objections against himself, unless he was perfectly satisfied of the correctness of both. And the case stood thus: The commission in which Saul engaged, must have been occasioned by an information brought to the chief priests and authorities in Jerusalem, from the enemies of the gospel in Damascus. The delegates who had brought the information, of course returned with Saul: and as they were Greeks or Hellenistic Jews, they might not understand the Hebrew language. It is further reasonable to suppose, that persons, concurring with the object of his commission, attended Saul in his journey: who as Jews, educated in the seat of Hebrew learning, must have understood the Hebrew tongue. When, therefore, Jesus appeared unto Saul, they *heard*, or, more conformably to the original, *understood* or *obeyed* the voice, that is, they became converts and joined with their principal, the persecuted party. But there was this difference in the vision: these attendants saw no man, that is, though they heard the voice of Jesus, they did not see his form, as Saul had done. The pre-eminent end to be answered by Saul's conversion, Jesus thus distinctly marked by shewing himself exclusively to him, as designed to bear his name before the Gentiles. Divine Wisdom, in order to meet the exigencies of the case, appointed that the rest of the party should remain among the enemies of the gospel. Accordingly Jesus declined to appear to them also. They saw the light indeed, and though they must have heard the sound of his voice, they did not comprehend it, nor of course did they, like the rest, become obedient to it. Now Luke, writing for the use of the believers, and having in his mind that party only who had joined them, writes, ‘And the men who journeyed with him, stood speechless, hearing the voice, but seeing no man.’ On the other hand, common sense required that Paul, when defending himself before his accusers, should

appeal to those of his party, who, as ignorant of the voice and purport of the vision, still continued among the enemies of the gospel. Accordingly he says, 'And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice, i. e. they neither comprehended nor obeyed the voice of him that spoke to me.'—Pp. 191—193.

We may grant to unbelievers most of their alleged variations in the apostolical history, without compromising the truth of Christianity. The character of historic truth, in relation to independent witnesses, is substantial agreement amidst incidental differences.

With the popular absurd notion of the efficacy of baptism in his head, Gamaliel Smith objects to the ceremony in the case of Paul, and expatiates on the immoral tendency of the doctrine, that it washes away sins. In answer, Ben David quotes the following passage from Lactantius, (lib. iii. c. 26,) "whose honeyed flow of eloquence procured him the appellation of the Christian Cicero"—

"The mighty energy of the divine precepts on the minds of men, is demonstrated by daily experience. Give to Christ a man that is irascible, reproachful or impetuous, and, by a few words of God, he will restore him mild as a lamb: give to Christ a man that is covetous and tenacious of his property; and he will give him back to you liberal, and distributing his money with both hands: give to Christ a man that is fearful of pain and of death; and he will presently despise crucifixion, and flames and torments: give to Christ a man that is lustful, an adulterer or a gambler; and you will soon see him sober, chaste and honest: give to Christ a man that is cruel and thirsty for blood; and his fury will be immediately changed into unfeigned clemency: give to Christ a man that is unjust, foolish or an offender; and he becomes equitable, prudent and inoffensive. *For by a single baptism all his wickedness will be washed.*"—Pp. 197, 198.

On the sentence put in italics, Ben David remarks,

"The last sentence of this writer illustrates what the early Christians meant by baptism. It was practised by them, not as an atonement for guilt, but as a symbol of moral purity: it was, on the part of those who submitted to it, an open avowal of their faith in Christ, a public declaration that, as his followers,

they were determined to forsake their sins, to correct their most favourite passions, to eradicate the most deeply-rooted vices, to imitate the example and obey the precepts of their divine Master. This rite, no doubt, in the course of time became much mistaken and abused. Paul was apprehensive of this consequence; and he declined the practice of it, as forming no part of that gospel which he was commissioned to preach."—P. 198.

Reverting to a position of the author of the "New Trial," &c., that in Paul's Epistles no trace is to be found of the existence of any such document as one of the four Gospels, Ben David quotes 2 Cor. viii. 18 as a direct testimony on the part of Paul to the Evangelist Luke:

"It is well known that Luke was the companion and fellow-labourer of Paul; and in 2 Cor. viii. 18, we meet with these words: 'We have sent with him our brother, whose praise by means of his gospel is throughout all the churches.' Here we see a person, whom Paul calls a brother, and in the next verse a *fellow traveller*, praised by all the CHURCHES, and praised too by means of his *gospel*. It follows then that this gospel was received by all the churches, and that the author was known to all the churches through the medium of his gospel: for this reason he is said to be proved, not by individuals in one place or in many places, to whom he might be personally known, but by all the churches, i. e. by all the societies of Christians who used his gospel. They must, therefore, have esteemed him as an honest man, who had published a history of his divine Master, deserving of universal credit for its accuracy, fidelity and truth."—Pp. 200, 201.

In a note, pp. 286, 287, the author defends this rendering of the passage, and points out the defining power of the Greek article:

"Sometimes things can be defined by only being connected: hence the article in Greek becomes a connective serving to attach an adjunct to its subject, or a property to its possessor. In such cases its import in English is expressed by the pronominal adjectives *my*, *thy*, *his*, *her*, *our*, *your*, *their*. Let us illustrate this application of the Greek article by a few examples. 'Οταν παραδῷ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατέρι' 1 Cor. xv. 24, 'When he shall deliver up the kingdom to the God and Father, i. e. to *his* God and Father;' which in the common translation is improperly 'to God even the Father.' Επιβαλλει τας χειρας επ' αυτον.

Acts xxi. 27, 'They laid *the* hands upon him, i. e. their hands upon him.' A Greek epigram has *χωλον την τον γουνώς τον πόδα*, 'Thou hast *the* mind lame as *the* foot, thou hast *thy* mind lame as *thy* foot, thou art lame in mind as well as in feet.' The Cyclops in Lucian, complaining to his father Neptune of the injury done him by Ulysses, says, *Κατεσφισατο με τῷ ουρανῷ*, 'he overreached me by *the* name, i. e. by *his* name,' the wily traveller having given *Ουτίς* instead of *Οδυσσεὺς* as his name, which proved the means of saving him from destruction. Let us apply this to one of the many cases the full force of which has been overlooked by the critics, 2 Cor. viii. 8: 'We have sent with him *the* brother, whose praise in *the* gospel is throughout all the churches,—we have sent with him *our* brother, whose praise by means of *his* gospel is throughout all the churches.' The brother here meant is Luke, whom Paul calls a fellow-traveller in the next verse. It was natural that, as Luke had written a gospel or a memoir of his divine Master, and, as he accompanied the Apostle Paul in establishing the Gentile Church, he should leave a copy in the possession of each church. And here we are very incidentally furnished with a happy testimony to the early existence of the Gospel of Luke, and to the estimation in which the author of it was held for his fidelity and truth."—Pp. 286, 287.

The author afterwards maintains that the Gospel of Luke was not only known and alluded to, but actually "*copied* by Paul." He finds this novel opinion on 1 Cor. xv. 3.

"We have seen that the Apostle speaks of the Gospel of his brother and fellow-labourer, (Luke,) as praised in all the churches. A Gospel thus known to and valued by all the churches, must have been equally known to and valued by Paul himself. Now I observe, and I make the observation with pleasure, that the Gospel of Luke was now open before Paul, and that the above paragraph written by him is but a transcript from it, in substance exactly, in words nearly, the same: and that it is to the authority of this Evangelist that he alludes when he says, 'For I delivered unto you, among the chief things, **WHAT I ALSO RECEIVED, OR WHAT I ALSO HAVE TAKEN.**' Turn to the twenty-fourth chapter of Luke, and there you will find what he has taken:—'And he said unto them, These are things which I said unto you while yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the

law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. Then he opened their mind that they might understand the Scriptures. Thus it is written, and thus the Christ ought to suffer, and to rise again from the dead the third day; and repentance and the dismission of sins must be preached in his name among all the nations.' The narrative of Luke implies that our Saviour died—that he was buried—that he rose—that he rose the third day—that he died and rose according to Moses, to the Psalms, and to the Prophets, i. e. according to the Scriptures—that repentance and the dismission of sins was to be preached in his name to the nations: and these are precisely the things which are attested by the apostle. It is to be observed, that Paul mentions 'according to the Scriptures' twice: and the same words are twice implied in Luke.

"It was not usual with the apostle to designate his divine Master simply under the name of 'Christ'; but here he so designates him, and designates him *once*: he is designated, and only once designated, under the same name by the Evangelist. Finally, Luke is the only Evangelist who says that Jesus, after his resurrection, appeared unto *Simon*, and that, after appearing unto *Simon*, he next appeared to the rest of the disciples. This is said, and said in the same order, by Paul, that he shewed himself to Cephas, (Simon Peter,) and then to the twelve."—Pp. 251, 252.

We cannot follow Ben David through all his replies to the Objector, but must content ourselves with taking here and there an interesting passage.

On the proposed resolution of James, in the apostolic council, that a decree should be sent to the Gentiles, that they should "abstain from things offered to idols, and from fornication, from blood and from things strangled," our author observes,

"The objects of worship among the Pagans, were impure in the extreme. By contemplating and ascribing solemn praise to such beings, the sanction of religion was given to lust and licentiousness; and their very temples were but brothels sacred to lewdness. For this reason idolatry and fornication were ever associated in the language and ideas of a Jew; and James here alludes to a passage in Moses, where they are united as cause and effect: 'They shall no more offer sacrifices to their false gods, whom they follow to commit fornication.' Lev. xvii. 7.

"The Pagans offered blood to the demons, and used it as a rite in invoking the souls of the dead. This we find in

Homer, *Odyss.* v. 535. Besides, to shed blood and to eat it, sounds alike in the ears of civilized society. And not only Moses but the common feelings of our nature, forbid the use of it. Things strangled, meant animals that were killed without letting their blood: and we are assured, that the offering of victims deprived of life by strangulation was in the number of the Pagan rites. We meet with a remarkable instance of this kind in the *Georgics* of Virgil, lib. iv. 299. Aristaeus, at the direction of his mother Cyrene, sacrifices four bullocks to appease the wood-nymphs for the restoration of his bees. The manner in which one of them is killed, is thus described: 'Then is sought a steer, whose forehead winds with biennial horns; while he violently struggles, both his nostrils and the breath of his mouth are stopped up; and when he is beaten to death, his crushed bowels putrefy, while his skin remains entire.' We shall find reason to believe that this vile practice prevailed in Egypt, whence it was borrowed by the Greeks and Romans as early as the days of Moses, and that it is one of the offensive impurities against which his prohibition is levelled. The question in debate was the observance of the ceremonial law. This law consisted of rites that, though not immoral, were useless, burdensome, and odious to the new converts, or of prohibitions that were irrational and debasing in the extreme. Of the first kind was the rite of circumcision; of the second were offerings made to idols, the use of blood and of animals strangled, with every species of impurity known to attend the Pagan worship. The decree proposed by James had for its object to cancel every rite that was merely national or ceremonial; while it acknowledged and enforced the perpetual obligation of those prohibitions, which were calculated to prevent the corruption of morals, and thus to co-operate with the purifying influence of the gospel.

"The reason which this Apostle gives for the resolutions proposed by him, is worthy of observation: 'For Moses from ancient times has in every city those who preach him, he being read in the synagogue every Sabbath:' which is to this effect: 'It is in vain for us to hold out to the Gentiles the duty of abstaining from their idolatrous rites and the impurities consequent on them, on the authority of Moses; for this experiment has been tried, and tried in vain, for ages: it is necessary, therefore, to forbid the same things on a higher authority—the authority of Christ through us; and in his name to enjoin a total abstinence from all such debasing practices as disqualify them to become members of a nobler

community in a future world.'—Pp. 227—229.

In a note (pp. 281—283) on the quotation of Virgil in this passage, the author displays more than his wonted ingenuity. (Ben David and Essenus are the same author.)

"The passage in Virgil is thus:—

" 'Tum vitulus, bima curvans jam
cornua fronte,
Quæritur; huic geminæ nares, et spli-
ritus oris
Multa reluctant obstruitur; plagiisque
perempto
Tunsa per integrum solvuntur viscera
pellem.'

"Presently it is said that a swarm of bees flew out of this carcase, as a shower from the clouds. Now, if we take this story in a literal sense, it must appear false and ridiculous. But in truth it was never intended to be so understood. The poet intimates, that it originated in Egypt, see *Georg.* lib. iv. 285. In a little work, entitled "A New Version of the First Three Chapters of Genesis, accompanied with Dissertations, illustrative of the Creation, the Fall of Man, the Principle of Evil, and the Plagues of Egypt," by Essenus, it is shewn that the facts of the Mosaic history form the basis of the Egyptian mythology. The fable of Aristaeus and his bees is another illustration of that assertion. The calf here intended was *APIS*, whom the Israelites, as devoted to Egyptian superstition, at first worshiped; see *Exod.* xxxii. The bees which issued from the carcase of this *Apis* were the Israelites themselves, who escaped from Egyptian bondage, and on the fruits of whose labour, while in slavery, the Egyptians lived as drones in a hive. The Greeks at first seem to have called bees *βεγοναι*, *Ox-begotten*, an idea evidently derived with their mythology from Egypt; and it is still more remarkable, that the Latins have preserved, without any change, the original *Apis* as a general name for bees.

"A plague fell on the bees and cattle of Aristaeus, because he had violated Eurydice, a beautiful woman, and the wife of Orpheus. If we cut off the termination of this last name, and read it from right to left, Orpheus in Hebrew is precisely *Pharaoh*—hence we discover the origin of the fable. A plague was sent on that monarch and his house, because of his conduct to Sarah, wife of Abraham, *Gen.* xii. 17. Eurydice in escaping is torn by a serpent, and Orpheus recovers her from hades by the charms of his music, but on condition that he should not look back, as she followed him to the

region of light. Forgetting, however, this condition, he did look back, and she vanished for ever. The source of this fiction will be found in Genesis xvii. 17—26.

“Aristaeus, by the assistance of his mother, compels *Proteus* to explain to him the cause of his disasters. This *Proteus* was a sea monster, who turned himself at will into all sorts of beasts, but principally into a lion. This we learn from the fourth *Odyssey* of Homer. The impostors, who delivered oracles in his name, were the authors of the fable about the bees; the main object of which seems to have been to ridicule the Israelites for worshiping as their god a strangled calf. According to Homer, *Proteus* was not in Egypt, but frequented the shores of an adjacent island: and we find him opposed to Jehovah among the Philistines, under the name of *Dagon*, which means a *fish* or *corn*, as the word is derived from one of two Hebrew terms very similar in sound, though thus different in sense. If then the devotees of *Dagon* or *Proteus*, under the fable of the strangled calf and the bees, ridiculed the Israelites and the true God; and if it was usual with *Proteus* to metamorphose himself into a lion, we shall see the purport of the following piece of history: ‘Then went Samson down and his father and his mother to Temnath—and behold a young lion roared against him, and the spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him: and he rent him as he would have rent a kid, and he had nothing in his hand.... And after a time he returned, and he turned aside to see the carcase of the lion, and behold there was a swarm of bees and honey in the carcase of the lion.’ Judges xiv. 5—9. This act was miraculous, inflicted in just and signal vengeance by a servant of the true God, to illustrate the folly and falsehood of those who trusted in the popular gods opposed to him. The punishment inflicted on *Dagon*, as meaning *corn*, was also very signal, but different. ‘And Samson went and caught three hundred foxes, and took fire-brands, and turned tail to tail, and put a fire-brand in the midst between two tails. And when he had set the brands on fire, he let them go into the standing corn of the Philistines; and burnt up both the shocks, and also the standing corn, with the vineyards and olives,’ chap. xv. 4, 5. The Philistines ascribed this corn to the bounty of *Dagon*, and its destruction proved the nullity of the god which they worshiped.”

Ben David has some very good observations upon Paul's last visit to Jerusalem, so strangely, and we might

say, so madly, misrepresented by Gamaliel Smith, and also upon the erroneous apprehension of the Thessalonians that Paul represented the end of the world as at hand, which is, as might have been expected, eagerly laid hold of by the same author as an argument against the apostle; but we can only refer to them, leaving the reader to satisfy himself by a perusal of the volume.

In Ben David, the Apostle of the Gentiles has an ardent admirer and an ingenious and eloquent advocate. No one who has read Gamaliel Smith ought to rest contented without reading likewise his learned answerer. We have sufficiently shewn that we cannot yield conviction to Ben David in all his hypotheses and criticisms, but we think, and have pleasure in stating, that the Christian world is indebted to him for his able and honest exposure of an attempt to destroy Christianity by an attack upon the Chief of the Apostles.

ART. III.—*The History of Christ, a Testimony to the sole Deity of the Father: and the Connexion between Divine and Human Philanthropy. Two Sermons, preached on the Morning and Evening of Sunday, September 14, 1823, at the Opening of the Unitarian Chapel, Young Street, Charlotte Square, Edinburgh.* By W. J. Fox. 8vo. pp. 44. Edinburgh, Bell and Bradfute; London, C. Fox and Co.

ART. IV.—*The Spirit of Unitarian Christianity. A Sermon, delivered at the Opening of the Finsbury Unitarian Chapel, on Sunday, Feb. 1st, 1824: To which is prefixed, An Address, delivered on laying the First Stone of the Chapel, on Thursday, May 22nd, 1823.* By W. J. Fox. 8vo. pp. 36. C. Fox and Co.

IN these kindred publications, Mr. Fox asserts the claims of the Unitarian doctrine with his wonted ability and ardour.

The first Sermon at Edinburgh, from John xviii. 37, is designed to shew that “Christ bore witness to Unitarian Christianity;” and after a judicious and satisfactory summary of “the History of Christ” as “a Testimony to the sole Deity of the Fa-

ther," the preacher concludes with an exhortation to consistency and firmness in the profession of the truth, to zeal for its diffusion, and to conformity with its dictates. He says, as truly as eloquently,

"Distraction and depression are the natural results of the notions of a plurality of divine persons, and of the vindictiveness of divine justice. They hide the truth, and, of course, obstruct and weaken, if not destroy, the feelings of pious gratitude which would spring up in its light. Above, heaven bends in benignant loveliness; and below, earth smiles in grateful and responsive fruitfulness, like God and the heart of man; but the interposing cloud that veils the glories of the one, casts a broader and deeper circle of gloom upon the other. From you that cloud has passed away. Soon may it in all regions, that to Him whose right they are, the prayers, and thanksgivings, and hearts of his children may be restored. The services for which this building is destined are not those of vain forms, or slavish feelings, or sectarian narrowness. It is the worship of the Father, 'in spirit and in truth,' that we would cultivate; not only here, but in our bosoms, our homes, our lives. We revere him in all the spirituality of his nature, the immensity of his presence, the paternity of his character. The universe is his temple; the dome of heaven its lofty roof; the plain of earth its wide basis; sun, moon and stars its glittering ornaments; every contrite heart an altar, every upright man a priest; and obedience and sincerity the incense that shall ascend to his palace and his throne, and draw down his gracious benediction."—Pp. 25, 26.

The Evening Sermon at Edinburgh is an argument, from 1 John iv. 11, for the truth of Unitarianism as a benevolent system, illustrating the love of God, and thus producing love to man. Mr. Fox here assumes the doctrine of universal restoration. The "Connexion between Divine and Human Philanthropy" is shewn by the following observations: 1. The mere exhibition of excellence disposes the observer to imitation. 2. The imitation of God is a Christian duty. 3. The condition on which God blesses each, is solicitude for the well-being of the whole. 4. The usual expression of divine love is the relation of Parent to us, and to all, which implies our fraternal relation to one another. 5. The object of God's love in the gospel is to excite, enlarge and strengthen

this mutual affection. 6. If God, the pure and infinite Spirit, loves man, much more should we, brethren in infirmity and sins, love each other. 7. God's love has endowed us with a common nature, deduced us from a common origin, and it designs for us ultimately a common destiny of joy.

In the second of these pamphlets, the Address on laying the First Stone of Finsbury Unitarian Chapel, stands at the beginning. It is a concise, perspicuous and manly declaration of Unitarianism, and an impressive description of the moral uses of a Christian House of Prayer. A pleasing tribute of gratitude and respect is paid towards the end to Winchester and Vidler, the former pastors of the congregation; and the Address terminates with a short, appropriate and solemn invocation of the Divine blessing.

The Sermon on the opening of the Chapel, from Rom. viii. 9, has for its object to vindicate the Unitarian system by demonstrating that its spirit is precisely the spirit of the gospel. The preacher selects for instances the several topics of *piety; faith; liberty and liberality; holiness; philanthropy, and hope.*

Some excellent observations are made (pp. 17—23) upon faith, which Mr. Fox treats, not as the belief of a string of propositions, but as "confidence in a faithful or benignant God."

The preacher sums up the subject of discourse, and exhibits a glowing practical illustration of it, in the following passage:

"We are strong in the plain and literal declarations of the New Testament; but we are yet stronger in the sameness of the *general impression* made by Christianity and Unitarianism as to the moral qualities with which these declarations are associated in the teacher's mind, and which they are designed to produce in the convert. The machinery is the same; the object the same; our system has the spirit of Christ, and is his, and Christianity is Unitarianism. And were it needful to illustrate this practically, not hard would be the task; for men who have had an abiding and universal sense of the Divine presence, who have shewn that God was in all their thoughts, and who seem to have made the very state of consciousness an act of adoration: men who with filial confidence could cast themselves on his protection, and obey the

servances of fast-days and sabbaths, were far, very far from being the righteous people Dr. Smith would represent them.

2ndly, That so far from the Genevese of the present day having become corrupt, irreligious and dissolute, since their departure from the faith of Calvin, they are particularly distinguished among the inhabitants of other cities of Europe, for the correctness of their moral conduct, and for the care they bestow on the religious education of the youth of both sexes.

3rdly, I have challenged, and still challenge Dr. Smith to name any populous city, where Calvinism is the dominant or prevailing religion, and where there is less vice and profligacy, less irreligion or blasphemy, than in Geneva; and to aid him in the comparison, I have directed his attention to Edinburgh, and to the Calvinists in England and elsewhere.

The whole of Dr. Smith's charges are founded on the assumption that the Genevese are more morally corrupt than the Calvinistic inhabitants of other large cities. He says to them, almost in direct words, "Stand off ye pastors and people of Geneva, for WE ARE HOLIER THAN YE; thank God we have not, like you, abandoned the faith of Calvin, and are not like you, dissolute, profligate, irreligious and blasphemous." I trust I have shewn, to the satisfaction of your readers, that this assumption resembles very closely the vain-glorious boasting of the Pharisee. Justice now imperiously demands that some notice should be taken of the outrageous attack made by Dr. Smith on the moral character of M. Chenevière, a minister of the gospel, most highly and deservedly esteemed by his fellow-citizens. The attack has been admitted into the pages of the Repository; admission cannot be refused to an exposure of its grossness and injustice; the character of an unprotected foreigner ought not to be defamed with impunity. M. Chenevière, in his "Summary of the Religious Controversies in Geneva," had occasion to refer to the translation of an English work, called "The Refuge," and has given a concise account of part of its contents; this has drawn upon him the most slanderous and virulent

abuse that was perhaps ever poured forth by a Christian minister on the head of a brother. The merits of the parties will be clearly seen by placing the passage from the Refuge and M. Chenevière's explanation in italics, and Dr. Smith's comments below:

M. Chenevière.

"Mr. Haldane waged war so indiscreetly against good works, that they were spoken of with disdain in the discourses of his adherents, and in the pamphlets circulated to perpetuate his influence, after his departure. In so licentious a manner was it common to treat this subject, that a young ecclesiastic did not blush to translate into French and to publish THE REFUGE, in which we read in so many words, that the man most deeply stained with crimes, and the man who has performed the greatest number of good works, are perfectly equal in the sight of God."

Extract from "The Refuge." See Mon. Repos. 469, quoted by Dr. J. P. Smith.

"Suppose a character among the apostate sons of Adam, in whom resides all the moral excellency that ever dignified human nature since the fall; and, on the other hand, one in whom concentrates all the moral evil committed since that fatal period; and it will be found on examination, that in point of justification before God, they stand on a perfect level. The accumulated virtue of the former, if pleaded as that which might render him acceptable to his Judge, would avail nothing; nor would the enormous guilt of the latter, simply considered, be an obstacle to the bestowment of grace and glory."

Such are the words in the Refuge, and such the meaning which M. Chenevière attaches to them, and such would, I fully believe, be the explanation given of the passage, by four-fifths of those who understand the English language, were they required to explain it. Now please to mark Dr. Smith; he says, "I take my stand on the insulated passage (from the Refuge) itself, and affirm that M. Chenevière could not have written what he has done, without deliberate fraud! He must have known that while he was writing so and so, 'we read in so many words,' he was

adducing what was not found there, in clauses, or words, or sentiments. I am at a loss for words to express my sense of the baseness of any one who could read the *Refuge* and then represent it as he has done; his heart must be hardened beyond even a very high degree of moral callousness. To such a heart falsehood must be food and the most outrageous calumnies a congenial delight!!!

I recommend to your readers to re-peruse the pages of the Monthly Repository, pp. 468, 469, which contain the passage from the *Refuge* more at length, with further abuse of M. Chenevière; I will leave them to determine whether such language as Dr. Smith employs, is what a Christian minister, a scholar, or a gentleman ought to use. Would Dr. Smith have addressed a respectable English minister in the same terms, had he given the same account of the passage in *The Refuge*? But M. Chenevière is a foreign heretic, and Dr. Smith thinks he may with impunity vilify him in the most disgusting and opprobrious terms; and though he must know he is degrading himself by so doing, he may consider it praise-worthy to disregard his own reputation, when he is attacking those whom he numbers among the enemies of heaven. Many persecuting bigots have done the same, and while they were indulging their own angry and vindictive feelings, have supposed that they were only animated with holy zeal for the honour of God; but heaven requires not the malignant passions to be called forth in its defence. We must not fight the cause of divine truth with such weapons as malice and all uncharitableness. Much better would it be to adopt the maxim of Tiberius, when called upon to resent some affront to the Roman deities—"Leave to the gods the care of their own wrongs." I say, much better would this be, than to make ourselves parties in their cause, and invoke the powers of darkness to our aid. The honest enthusiast, George Fox, used to say, "That people too often raised the devil in their own minds, to oppose what they thought wrong in others." If Dr. Smith have done so, I would earnestly exhort him to lose no time in laying the evil spirit, and, like our first parent, in

the "cool of the day," when the fervour of passion has subsided, let him hearken to the still, small voice of conscience; then will he feel deeply ashamed that the naked grossness of his abuse is not concealed by the anonymous leaves of a Review; then will he be sensible that he has exhibited to the world, in his own name and person, a melancholy specimen of the gentle spirit and Christian charity of a Calvinist divine. Will the Unitarians of England, or the heretics in Geneva, be deeply affected by his example, and persuaded to embrace a faith which produces such overflowings of brotherly love?

When Dr. Smith tells a highly-respectable Christian minister, "that he is guilty of deliberate fraud and falsehood, that his heart is hardened beyond a very high degree of moral callousness, that falsehood is its food, and the most outrageous calumnies a congenial delight," he ought, at least, to have some foundation for the charge, which, I hold, he has not. I hope, however, that these hints and admonitions will not be thought by Dr. Smith either ill-timed or unfriendly, for he is our real friend who warns us when we have wandered into a dangerous path. I feel assured that he will abstain from the use of such disgraceful language in future. When he again addresses a brother minister of the gospel, if he be even an erring brother, he will greet him with some more gentle and endearing appellation than "deliberate liar," a "callous-hearted devourer of outrageous calumnies."

With respect to the insulated passage from "The Refuge," I confess myself unable to attach any other meaning to it, than what M. Chenevière has given. To me it appears to contain the most demoralizing doctrine that was ever published; it confounds all moral distinctions, and strikes at the very foundation of religion and civil society, by representing a Nero and an Antoninus, a Thurstell and a Howard, "to stand in point of justification on a perfect level before God." A doctrine more fatal to the peace of mankind was never promulgated; but though such are my most serious and earnest feelings respecting it, I would not revile Dr. Smith for believing that this doctrine may be

true and salutary; he may have, and I dare say he has some recondite interpretation, by which he moulds it into accordance with his own views of Christianity, but he ought to have a little candour and charity for those whose understandings are not so pliable.

I must now notice some of the charges which Dr. Smith brings against the pastors of Geneva in their collective capacity, as a Synod or Consistory. He tells us, "M. Malan was dragged before the Consistory, interrogated like a criminal at the bar, or rather like a victim of the holy office of Madrid, and finally deprived and degraded, so far as it was in the power of M. Chenevière and his ruthless associates to degrade such a man; a man whose appearance before them forcibly reminds us of that of Hus and Jerome before the Council of Constance." It is, I think, scarcely possible for misrepresentation to go farther in describing a plain transaction. M. Malan, though still regarding himself as a member and pastor of the Established Genevese Church, erected a chapel in his own garden, where he preached against and reviled in no measured terms the doctrines and the pastors of that Church. This was borne with silence by the Consistory for three years, when M. Malan began to encroach more and more on the pastoral functions in the parishes of the Genevese Clergy, and violated the rules and regulations relating to the examination and admission of young persons to the Lord's Supper, and also for the admission of Catholic converts, assuming, at the same time, the title of Pastor.

Now, three things only remained for the Consistory to do; 1st, either to suffer the rules and regulations of their Church to be violated by a person who styled himself one of its pastors; or, 2ndly, To suspend or expel him without any hearing or examination; or, 3rdly, To cite him before them in order to hear his defence and examine into his conduct, before he was expelled. The latter was the only rational and just line of conduct which they could adopt, and they appear to have treated M. Malan with exemplary gentleness and forbearance. Had they expelled M. M. without citing him before them, or what Dr. Smith

"calls dragging him before them," we should have heard from his partisans a most violent outcry of intolerance and persecution. M. Malan, however, after many long-protracted equivocations, did what a sensible and honest man ought to have done several years before, he sent in a written declaration of his entire separation from the Genevese Church. After this the Consistory and magistrates could have no power over his conduct, so long as he did not violate the laws of his country.

Had M. Malan separated himself from the Genevese Church when he first opposed its authority and doctrines, he would, I think, have shewn more of a true Christian spirit than what he has evinced by his opposition, but then he would not have acquired so much celebrity, or been so much talked of as a martyr or confessor. I believe, however, that M. M. was strongly acted upon by a party in this country, that wished him to remain a Pastor of the Genevese Church, in order to annoy it more effectively: to this influence his vacillating conduct (justly exposed by M. Chenevière) may, I believe, be chiefly attributed. I trust we shall now hear no more of the "*dragging of M. Malan*," though we must admit that Dr. Smith has a wonderful talent, like Cacus in the *Aeneid*, of dragging facts by the wrong end, in order to conceal their true position and bearing, and to press them into his own service. There is one part of M. Chenevière's statement, with which I cannot agree: it is that where he speaks of M. Malan, as if he considered him censurable for continuing to conduct religious worship in his own chapel, in defiance of what he styles the civil and religious authority. Surely when M. M. had entirely separated himself from the Genevese Church, he was, or ought to be, at liberty to worship according to the dictates of his conscience; and, in fact, notwithstanding this censure, he was left at perfect liberty so to do. It must be remembered that the Church of Geneva has been a State-religion ever since it was made so by Calvin and his contemporaries, and, perhaps, the world never saw an instance of an Established Church suffering one of its ministers to secede from it, and to preach against its doc-

trines, without regarding him as a dangerous schismatic. Would the Calvinist Kirk of Scotland treat a seceding minister with the same lenity and forbearance as M. Malan has experienced from the Genevese Church? In justice, however, both to M. Malan and the Church of Geneva, it should be stated, that the secession of a regular pastor was, under all the circumstances, an entirely novel case, and it may well be believed that, with the best intentions on both sides, they might be much embarrassed, and uncertain how to act in the best manner. Dr. Smith compares M. Malan before the Consistory, to Huss or Jerome before the Council of Constance: I am almost surprised that he has not compared the Consistory to the Jewish Sanhedrim, and M. Malan to a much higher personage than either of the two Reformers. The partizans of M. Malan, at Geneva, discover in his physiognomy a striking resemblance to the head of Christ, as drawn by the best Italian masters; and it must be confessed that the parting of the hair over the forehead, from whence it descends in long waving curls to the shoulders, combined with an agreeable and benevolent expression of countenance, tend to confirm the illusion. This is highly favourable to him as the leader of a new sect: were his hair to be cut in the modern fashion, he would, I believe, perceive, like Samson, that his strength had in some degree departed from him.

The Pastors of the Canton de Vaud have not escaped the condemnation of Dr. Smith. They are, he says, believers in the Deity of Christ, but that is not sufficient to save them from perdition, for they believe in the doctrine of Free Will, they are Pelagians or Semi-Pelagians, and, therefore, Dr. Smith, from his judgment-seat at Homberton, pronounces them to be formalists in religion, "and to hold the truth in unrighteousness"!! What! does Dr. J. Pye Smith assume the attributes of an Omniscient God! None but He who seeth the secrets of all hearts can know whether a nation or society of respectable Christians hold the truth in unrighteousness or not. The arrogance of such rash judgments, pronounced by weak and fallible men, can only be equalled by their monstrous absurdity. "Who art thou

that judgest another?" "Judge not, that ye be not judged." Surely these moral admonitions in the gospel are too much undervalued by Dr. Smith. A great portion of his letters, relating to Geneva, proceeds upon the assumption of his power to search the hearts of other men, and of his right to pass judgment upon them, which he does as freely as if he were admitted into the deep counsels of heaven. The Pastors of Geneva, than whom a body of more truly respectable ministers cannot be found, exemplifying the sincerity of their faith by the simplicity and integrity of their lives, and by their active exertions in the discharge of their various duties, yet these men Dr. Smith most presumptuously pronounces to be all that the false teachers were of old, quoting against them the words of Isaiah lvi. 10. He looks into their hearts and sees that many of them know not what they believe; and the heart of one of them feeds upon falsehood. The people of Geneva, notwithstanding all appearances to the contrary, are dissolute, profligate, blasphemous and impious. The Pastors of the Pays de Vaud "hold the truth in unrighteousness;" and what is to be the future fate of such, is well known. Thus does Dr. Smith consign whole bodies of people to perdition, with as much *nonchalance* as if he were ordering his cook to kill a fowl for his dinner. Now, of these people whom he so freely condemns, I believe he knows little or nothing, except it be from hearsay, but they are heretics, and that is sufficient: "*his own resources*" will enable him to decide their present condition and future doom. It is too much the daily habit of certain religionists to assume the functions of Omnipotence, and to divide mankind into goats and sheep, classing among the former those Christian sects who differ on what they call essentials: Arians, Socinians and Unitarians are consigned to Tartarus, with a single word: Pelagians, Semi-Pelagians and Sabellians "hold the truth in unrighteousness," their fate is also sealed: others are guilty of "formalism," and are not, perhaps, quite hopeless. These self-elected judges seem to forget that the final Judge of mankind will not be Calvin, but Christ. The great inquiry we are